

REACTIONS TO WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT  
AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER, SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES,  
SEX-ROLE ORIENTATION, AND JUST WORLD BELIEFS

By

DARLENE PUCKETT

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1984

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my respect and admiration for Dr. Marvin Shaw and also, my gratitude for his having served as my major advisor. I have greatly appreciated the amount of structure and growth I have experienced under his supervision throughout my graduate training. I would also like to thank Dr. Scott for his advice and assistance with the development of the model for my doctoral research and the data analysis. I thank Dr. Olejnik for his thoughtful assistance with the data analysis and for his words of encouragement. I also appreciate Dr. Epting's words of encouragement and Dr. Landsman's moral support. I personally thank Dr. Meek who first suggested the idea of conducting a survey of University of Florida employees on the topic of sexual harassment and also, for giving that "little extra push" to me during the write-up phase of my doctoral research. I would also like to extend personal thanks to Otilia, who helped me with gathering materials for the survey mailings and for the use of her typewriter and to Gerri (the typist of this dissertation), for being so considerate. I personally thank my close friends who supported me during the difficult and trying times. To my family members, I thank you for serving as positive role models for me. And finally, I thank God, from whom all blessings flow.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
- Defining Sexual Harassment.....	2
- Variables Comprising Sexual Harassment in the Workplace.....	3
- A Profile of the Sexually Harassed Victim.....	3
- Power and Authority Relationships.....	6
- Actions Constituting Sexual Harassment.....	11
Physiological and Psychological Consequences of Sexual Harassment.....	17
Coping Strategies and the Consequences of Reporting Sexual Harassment.....	20
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Guidelines.....	25
A Model for Studying Reactions to Sexual Harassment.....	26
Conclusions.....	29
Gender and Power-Laden Male-Female Relations.....	29
Sex-Role Orientation.....	32
Just World Beliefs.....	33
Implications of the Literature and Overview of Hypotheses.....	34
II METHOD.....	38
Subjects.....	38
Design.....	38
Survey Questionnaire.....	38
Procedure.....	42
III RESULTS.....	44
Analyses.....	44
Descriptive Analyses.....	45
Identification.....	45

CHAPTER	Page
Affective Reaction.....	49
Perceived Seriousness.....	50
Self-Confidence.....	51
Expectation of Penalty for Refusal.....	53
Coping Strategy.....	54
Summary of Results.....	55
IV DISCUSSION.....	59
Conclusions.....	64
Implications for Future Research.....	66
REFERENCES.....	68
APPENDIX	
A SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	73
B COVER LETTERS.....	76
C DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS.....	79
D CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE (DV) MEASURES BY SCENARIO.....	82
E MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS.....	85
F UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS.....	91
G MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE ON OVERALL AFFECTIVE REACTION SCORES.....	97
H UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON COPING STRATEGY.....	98
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	100

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Univariate Analyses of Covariance on IDEN 3 and FATE 3 as a Covariate for Androgyny versus Non-Androgyny in Terms of Gender, Supervisory Responsibilities (SR) and Just World Beliefs.....	47
2	Comparison of Respondents for IDEN 3 with FATE 3 as a Covariate in Terms of Mean Sex-Role Orientation Scores as a Function of Gender, Supervisory Responsibilities (SR), and Just World Beliefs.....	48
3	Univariate Analyses of Variance Performed on Self-Confidence 3 Scores for Gender as a Function of Supervisory Responsibilities (SR) and Sex-Role Orientation.....	53
4	Univariate Analyses of Variance on COPE 1 and COPE 2 for Supervisory Responsibilities (SR) as a Function of Sex-Role Orientation.....	56

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

REACTIONS TO WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT  
AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER, SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES,  
SEX-ROLE ORIENTATION, AND JUST WORLD BELIEFS

By

Darlene Puckett

August, 1984

Chairman: Marvin E. Shaw  
Major Department: Psychology

The purpose of the present study was to investigate reactions to fictional supervisor-, co-worker-, and subordinate-initiated sexual harassment incidents as a function of gender, supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation (androgyny versus non-androgyny), and just world beliefs. These independent variables were tested on outcome variables labeled identification, affective reaction, perceived seriousness, self-confidence, fate similarity, expectation of penalty for refusal and coping strategy.

A factorial survey of 500 randomly selected University of Florida employees was undertaken to test the independent variables. Two-hundred and seventy-one employees (125 males and 146 females) returned the survey questionnaire.

Significant findings consisted of the following: (1) a significant four-way interaction between gender, supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation, and just world beliefs for identification with the victim in the subordinate-initiated harassment; (2) affective reaction

regarding the offender's behavior was significant for supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation, and just world beliefs for the supervisor- and subordinate-initiated harassments; (3) perceived seriousness regarding the offender's behavior was significant for gender for the supervisor- and the subordinate-initiated harassments; (4) self-confidence regarding the handling of the offender's behavior was significant for gender and sex-role orientation for the co-worker- and subordinate-initiated harassments; (5) expectation of penalty for refusal to submit to the offender was significant for gender and sex-role orientation for the supervisor- and subordinate-initiated harassments; and (6) coping strategy regarding the harassment was significant for the supervisory responsibilities and sex-role orientation for all three harassment conditions.

Hypotheses related to significant identification with the victim for each independent variable were not supported. Also, the self-confidence hypothesis pertaining to significant sex-role orientation differences for female respondents over all harassment conditions was not supported. Insufficient evidence was obtained to support the hypothesis regarding significant gender differences for expectation of penalty for refusal for the supervisor-initiated harassment.

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A growing number of females are continually entering the workforce and, of course, workplaces are usually male-oriented or male-dominated. Therefore, men are in most of the positions of power and influence in hierarchical work structures. Organizational power structures are conducive to intimate violations such as sexual harassment. Currently, corporate or job-related sexual harassment is a growing area of empirical testing and litigation. Although research efforts have revealed some progress in understanding the dynamics of sexual harassment, the area is still fertile ground for empirical investigations (e.g., Brewer, 1982).

Overall, social-consciousness of sexual harassment has increased (e.g., Brewer, 1982). Nevertheless, individual cognitive differences concerning reactions to sexual harassment continue to exist (Brewer and Berk, 1982) despite recent research undertakings and the 4-year existence of the EEOC guidelines (which hold the employer responsible for all acts of sexual harassment in the workplace; Federal Register, 1980). The purpose of the present study is to extend the research on individual cognitive and power differences regarding sexual harassment by examining reactions to workplace sexual harassment as a function of organizational power differences and respondent characteristics.



### Defining Sexual Harassment

Beyond the obvious lewd cases, sexual harassment is difficult to define (e.g., Collins and Blodgett, 1981). Its elusiveness resides in the fact that behavior that may be manageable flirting for one person may cause another individual to experience adverse physiological and psychological problems. Hence, sexual harassment is a highly subjective concept.

Concentrated attention and efforts have been and are continually being undertaken to determine the definition (or the exact nature) of sexual harassment and its prevalence. Recent results of experimental investigations in the area of sexual harassment have revealed the following definitions of sexual harassment:

Sexual harassment . . . is any unwanted pressure involving one's sexuality. (Renick, 1980, p. 658)

(Sexual harassment is) . . . the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power. (MacKinnon, 1979, p. 1)

Sexual harassment involves the problem of individuals who use their power and position in an organization to extort sexual gratification from their subordinate. (Seymour, 1979, p. 139)

Harassment at its extreme occurs when a male in a position to control, influence, or affect a woman's job, career, or grades uses his authority and power to coerce the woman into sexual relations or to punish her refusal. (Abramson, 1979, p. 173)

Sexual harassment is any repeated and unwanted sexual comments, looks, suggestions, or physical contact that you find objectionable or offensive and that causes you discomfort on your job. (Farley, 1978, p. 20)

Any sexually oriented practice that endangers a woman's job—that undermines her job performance and threatens her economic livelihood . . . . (Skrocki, 1978, p. 43)

The major defining features which generally comprise occurrences of sexual harassment include 'unwanted' sexual attention, 'unequal power' (or authority) relations, 'repeated' harassment, and gender stratifications. Overall, most definitions of sexual harassment "include some concepts of coercion or the misuse of differential power" (Somers and Clementson-Mohr, 1979, p. 31) and the key defining feature appears to be that of 'unwanted' (i.e., objectionable, unreciprocated, unsolicited, or unwelcomed) sexual attention (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Brewer, 1982; Crocker, 1983). For present purposes, workplace sexual harassment is the repeated and unwanted assertion of an employee's sexual identity over his/her occupational identity and which the recipient may be emotionally intolerant of to the point of adversely affecting his/her well-being. Attention will now be given to the important variables surrounding this contemporary and very controversial cultural phenomenon.

#### Variables Comprising Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

##### A Profile of the Sexually Harassed Victim

Mary Bularzik (1978), in giving a historical account of sexual harassment, wrote that during the 19th and 20th centuries, "the most common description of the harassed victim . . . was young, single, immigrant, uneducated, and unskilled" (p. 30). Others have documented the following similar descriptions of the most vulnerable female: the single female; the recently divorced female (and who is perhaps just reentering the job market); the female with few job skills and who is thus in a low-paying job; and the female worker who is the head of the household (or the sole breadwinner) with children to support (e.g., Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982).

Perhaps, it is true that the most vulnerable victim in terms of sexual harassment is the female who fits any one of the aforementioned descriptions; however, as empirically discovered by Susan Meyer and Karen Sauvigne of the Working Women's United Institute (WWUI), "no woman, whatever her job, age, race, or marital status is really free from (or immune to) harassment" (Lindsey, 1977, p. 50). This seems to be the general consensus among other researchers as well (e.g., Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Brandenburg, 1982; Silverman, 1976-77). However, evidence does exist which seems to indicate that historically the specific forms of sexual harassment have varied according to occupation and social class (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Silverman, 1976-77). For example, Backhouse and Cohen (1981) have pointed out that professional and managerial women are generally subjected to the subtler forms of sexual harassment (e.g., verbal suggestive remarks). However, working class women (i.e., "women working at the bottom of the economic scale") have often been subjected to both physical and verbal harassment (p. 33).

As previously stated, a female does not have to be young to be a victim of sexual harassment, nor must she be glamorous (Collins and Blodgett, 1981; Lindsey, 1977). It cannot be unequivocally stated that the female victim is generally younger than the male initiator since existing evidence is, at best, insufficient at this point in time. It was discovered however, in the sexual harassment survey of Gutek, Kakamura, Gahart and Handschumacher (1980) that the female respondents reported the male initiators as somewhat older ("modal age category was 40-49" for the male offender) (p. 261). In their survey of sexual harassment, Collins and Blodgett (1981) discovered that most of their

female respondents do not believe that an unattractive appearance will somehow counteract sexual advances. Nevertheless, attractive women who are victimized sometimes feel that they, themselves, are in some way to blame for such advances (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981). This matter will be further expounded.

Inherent in several definitions of sexual harassment is the notion that such acts are male-initiated (Abramson, 1979; Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Farley, 1978; Schneider, 1982; and Skrocki, 1978). Although females are generally the recipients of male-initiated sexual harassment, it has been discovered that males have been victims of sexual harassment (although this is an infrequent occurrence) (e.g., Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Bralove, 1976; Brandenburg, 1982; Gutek et al. 1980; Rowe, 1981; Schneider, 1982; Seymour, 1979; Tangri et al. 1982; White, 1977). Furthermore, research efforts surrounding such occurrences have yielded interesting findings. Although, male victimization is usually initiated by females, this is not always the rule (Gutek et al. 1980; Schneider, 1982; and Tangri et al. 1982). The survey by Tangri et al. (1982) of sexual harassment in the federal workplace revealed that single and divorced men are more likely to be victims than married men and the incidence rate for widowers is somewhat lower than for married men. Additionally, Tangri et al. have pointed out that men are more likely the victims of "clumsy or insensitive expressions of attractions" (p. 52). In terms of attractiveness, the male victims in the research by Gutek et al. (1980) described their female initiators as "relatively young, relatively attractive, and not known by the respondents for a long period of time" (p. 261).

Admittedly, relatively little is known regarding the prevalence of the harassed male victim. Further information may be forthcoming as the workplace become increasingly populated with professional female workers and more men move into traditional female jobs (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981). Such occurrences may result in the likelihood of equal sex-victimization. At any rate, the majority of the presented literature review reflects a pattern of the victimized female and the male offender.

In summary, the most vulnerable victim is the female regardless of her occupational status, age, race, marital status, or attractiveness. Historically, subtle forms of sexual harassment were displayed toward female workers in general and extreme forms toward females in menial positions. Also, at this point in time, it is unclear whether a set pattern exists for the female victim's and the male offender's ages. Male victimization is an infrequent occurrence initiated by males as well as females. Research regarding male victimization reveals that male victims are generally single and divorced with the incidence rate for widowers being somewhat lower than for married men, that male victimization may be characterized as awkward and insensitive expressions of attraction, and that male victims describe their female initiators as young and attractive, and the length of their association as being short.

#### Power and Authority Relationships

"Sexual harassment is a way to assert power" (Sexual harassment, 1979, p. 120); and it "is an assertion of power that happens to be expressed in a physical manner" (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981, p. 36). What is generally meant by such power is the means to control resources

people, and things (Wolf and Fligstein, 1979). According to Wolf and Fligstein, a number of aspects of power exist in the workplace. For example, Wolf and Fligstein consider authority to be an aspect of power and they define authority as the means to control the work process of others. Authority is also considered to be the "most salient of all aspects (of power) and the most important for locating individuals in the hierarchy of work" (Wolf and Fligstein, 1979, p. 97). Therefore, for present purposes, the terms power and authority are used interchangeably.

Undeniably, sexual harassment offenders may be in positions other than those of power (e.g., Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Bralove, 1976; Brewer, 1982; Lindsey, 1977; Rowe, 1981; Schneider, 1982; Silverman, 1976-77; Skrocki, 1978). Subordinates, co-workers, clients, and customers, as well as supervisors, are all perpetrators of sexual harassment. And yet, the perceived seriousness, labeling, and reported incidents of sexual harassment seem to indicate that sexual harassment may be more related to power than to sex and thus offenders are generally in positions of power (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Bralove, 1976; Collins and Blodgett, 1981; Gutek, Kakamura, Gahart and Handschumacher, 1980; Lindsey, 1977; Livingston, 1982; Reilly, Carpenter, Dull and Bartlett, 1982; Silverman, 1976-77; Skrocki, 1978; Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982; Weber-Burdin and Rossi, 1982; White, 1977).

In a recent survey conducted by the Working Women's United Institute (WWUI), more than half of the male offenders were in work positions superior to those of the female respondents (Silverman, 1976-77). Moreover, two-thirds of the male offenders of the WWUI survey were in a position to exert some economic pressure on the victim. The research

findings of Gutek et al. (1980) are in agreement with the WWUI survey results. In categorizing various actions considered to be forms of sexual harassment, Gutek et al. discovered that "females, compared to males, reported more of each category of behavior being initiated by the respondent's supervisor and, in general, the percentage of supervisor-initiated behavior increased as imposition and involvement increased" (1980, p. 262).

Collins and Blodgett's (1981) research efforts (involving Harvard Business Review (HBR) subscribers as respondents) revealed that the majority of the respondents (both males and females) "correlate the perceived seriousness of the behavior with the power of the person making the advance" (p. 77). These respondents view the supervisor's behavior as worse than the co-worker's.

Drawing on survey samples of lesbian and heterosexual working women, Schneider (1982) discovered that although most (and less serious) sexual advances were initiated by co-workers, such behaviors were responded to with less negative affect (or more ambivalence). In an experimental study in which status and behavior were manipulated, Livingston (1982) found that females have stronger negative reactions when harassed by a male superior than by an equal- or lower-status male regardless of the degree of imposition of the behavior. The data of a similar study conducted by Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) are supportive of Livingston's findings.

Data from experimental investigations of perceived harassment in university settings (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull and Bartlett, 1982; Weber-Burdin and Rossi, 1982) suggest that harassment initiated by lower-status instructors (graduate student teaching assistants) may be

perceived as being less serious or inappropriate than the same behaviors initiated by high-status faculty (professors). On the other hand, "the survey of airline personnel (Littler-Bishop, Seidler-Feller and Opaluch, 1982) obtained just the opposite pattern--higher incidence and less negative reaction to social-sexual behaviors initiated by higher-status than by equal- or lower-status personnel" (Brewer, 1982, p. 152-153). Data from the airline personnel survey suggest that the airline cleaners reportedly engaged in the mildest, least intrusive behavior while the pilots reportedly participated in the greatest amount of harassment overall. Reportedly, the pilots initiated significantly more acts of sexual comment and touch than the other groups (i.e., the ticket agents and airline cleaners).

Littler-Bishop and her associates (1982) explained their findings of less negative reactions to high-status harassers by suggesting that "when one's status level is so obviously defined, women may feel more pressure to respond favorably to high-status males than they would in a work setting that de-emphasizes status by using first names, street clothes and overlapping work tasks" (p. 147). Brewer (1982) suggests that the inconsistent findings of this survey and the previously mentioned studies (Livingston, 1982; Reilly et al. 1982; Schneider, 1982; Tangri et al. 1982; Weber-Burdin and Rossi, 1982) may indicate a need to distinguish between status and power in the work setting. Moreover, she states that status has a social-exchange value and thus it may cause an individual to respond favorably to a high-status harasser particularly if the act does not involve physical coercion or force (which, seemingly, was never the case in the airline personnel survey). In such situations then, unsolicited sexual advances may not necessarily



be unwanted. However, if the harasser has direct authority over the victim, "the positive implications of status may be offset by the negative effects associated with feelings of vulnerability and inability to resist advances" (p. 153). Specifically, Brewer proposes the following:

Small status distinctions may be associated with relatively little power differential and positive social exchange value, whereas large status differences (at least within an organization) may inevitably carry differential power and attendant negative implications . . . .

While status and power are highly correlated in most organizational settings, it should be possible to distinguish among role relationships in terms of the degree of status differential relative to the power differential. This, in turn, should be predictive of the positive versus negative components associated with social-sexual behavior in that relationship. Thus, for example, the role relationship between airline pilots and flight attendants may be characterized more by status differential than by direct power, in contrast to the typical role relationship between an executive and a clerical office worker in which differences in status are confounded with power differences. (p. 152-153)

Conceivably, the labeling of sexual harassment in the workplace suggests some consciousness of power inequality. Schneider (1982) asserts that the factors which predict a working woman's use of sexual definitions are indirect measures of social and economic powerlessness, particularly if a female worker feels that "implicit is the threat that a refusal (may) hurt (one's) career or salary" (Bralove, 1976, p. 1). Thus, sexual harassment to working women may indeed mean "an assertion of power, manifested in sexual approaches that are disliked and unwanted . . . ." (Schneider, 1982, p. 95).

To recapitulate, sexual harassment is an assertion of power that is expressed in disliked and unwanted sexual approaches. Although sexual harassment offenders may be in positions other than those of

power, generally this is not the case. The research literature in the area of the power or authority relationship and sexual harassment implies that the perceived seriousness, labeling, and reported incidents of sexual harassment seem to indicate that sexual harassment may be more related to power than to sex. Since the research findings in this regard are not entirely consistent, it is suggested that a need to distinguish between status and power in the workplace is warranted. A power differential and social-exchange value conceptual framework may also be useful with such an undertaking. Further, it is suggested that some consciousness of power inequality exists given the labeling of sexual harassment in the workplace.

#### Actions Constituting Sexual Harassment

Since the concept of sexual harassment includes both objective/behavioral and subjective/interpretative aspects, it should come as no surprise that some discrepancy in people's perceptions exist in terms of which types of actions constitute sexual harassment (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull and Bartlett, 1982). On the one hand, researchers have identified specific types of behavior as constituting sexual harassment (e.g., Brewer, 1982; Somers and Clementson-Mohr, 1979) and yet, according to one researcher, "most studies have not directly asked women workers which behaviors or situations they themselves thought were sexual harassment" (Schneider, 1982, p. 76). However, seemingly unquestionable is the research finding that females tend to categorize more kinds of actions as constituting sexual harassment than do males (e.g., Gutek, Kakamura, Gahart and Handschumacher, 1980; Reilly et al. 1982). Following is an account of what has been discovered in the area of actions constituting sexual harassment.

The Project on the Status and Education of Women, a committee of the Association of American Colleges, identified seven types of behavior which have been adopted as operational definitions of sexual harassment by several researchers and include the following: "verbal harassment, leering, offensive sexual remarks, unwanted touching, subtle pressure for sexual activity, overt demands for sexual activity, and physical assault" (Somers and Clementson-Mohr, 1979, p. 28). "Verbal harassment" (or offensive sexual commenting) has been reported to include comments regarding a woman's appearance, body, and demeanor (Gutek et al. 1980). "Leering" looks are usually of a clearly suggestive nature such as the "ogling of a woman's body" (Abramson, 1979, p. 173). "Unwanted touching" usually involves patting, pinching, (constant) brushing against, and grabbing the victim's body (Abramson, 1979; Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Kalogera, 1981). And of course, "physical assault" is outright rape or attempted rape (Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978). Thus, behaviors constituting sexual harassment range from subtle to coercive sexual advances and generally are repetitive or frequent in nature (e.g., Gutek et al. 1980).

Although surveys of sexual harassment tend to be methodologically weak (e.g., self-selected samples), the results are nevertheless valuable in gauging the prevalence and significance of the problem. In 1976, over 9,000 women responded to an informal Redbook magazine questionnaire entitled "How Do You Handle Sex on the Job" (Lindsey, 1977; Oshinsky, 1980). Of the 9,000 respondents, 88 percent had experienced some form of sexual harassment and 48 percent knew of job loss due to harassment. Although not a scientific survey, this survey provided the first nationwide statistics on sexual harassment of working women.

Similar findings were obtained in other informal surveys of employment-related sexual harassment (Bralove, 1976; Lindsey, 1977; MacKinnon, 1979).

In 1977, a University of Texas sociologist surveyed 481 working women, all of whom reported that they had suffered some form of sexual harassment (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981). "Sexual advances mentioned by the women included leering or ogling (36 percent), hints and verbal pressures (37 percent), and touching, brushing against, grabbing or pinching (3 percent). Male supervisors asked 18 percent of the women away for a weekend, and 6 percent said they were promised rewards for their other-than-business activities" (p. 34-35). Kalogera (1981) obtained similar findings in his survey of state female employees in addition to 1 percent of his sample's reports of experiences of coercive sex.

In May, 1980, the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB) surveyed 23,964 federally employed men and women and obtained an 84.8 percent response rate (Livingston, 1982). Of the female respondents to the survey,

42% reported experiencing sexual harassment on the job. Of these, 3,139 reported at least one experience involving a man and provided enough details about the incident of harassment to be further analyzed. Of this subsample, 2% had experienced 'most severe' harassment (attempted or actual rape), while 65% reported experiencing 'severe' sexual harassment, e.g., pressure for sexual favors, deliberate touching, or letters and phone calls. An additional 34% had reported experiencing 'less severe' harassment, e.g., pressure for dates, suggestive looks, or sexual remarks. (p. 13)

It should be noted that the data set of the USMSPB survey is the first random sample involving nonself-selected individuals (Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982).

In reviewing the literature on sexual harassment, Brewer (1982) indicated that social-sexual behaviors included for study tend to fall mainly in three categories: "coercive or physically intrusive behavior, offensive verbalization, and more flirtatious behavior such as compliments or requests for dates . . . (p. 150).

Further,

there appears to be high consensus among survey respondents, across studies and populations that behaviors in the first category constitute sexual harassment. Whether behaviors of the second or third type are perceived as harassment is apparently highly variable, dependent on situational factors (e.g., appropriateness to work role expectations) and respondent characteristics (e.g., feminist attitudes). (Brewer, 1982, p. 150)

Vogelmann-Sine, Ervin, Christensen, Warmsun and Ulmann (1979) have also noted the importance of knowing how social-sexual behaviors are interpreted in complex interpersonal situations in order to avoid possible misunderstanding of intent. Also a significant gap seemingly exists between males and females in their perception of the frequency and type of sexual harassment that actually occurs at the workplace (e.g., Benson and Thompson, 1982).

In the survey of heterosexual and lesbian women workers cited earlier, Schneider (1982) found that, ". . . being asked for a date is the behavior least likely to be included in women's ideas of sexual harassment" (p. 92). Further, the data indicate

that in addition to feminist identification, women in socially or economically powerless or vulnerable positions--new arrivals to the job, poorly paid workers, those in male-dominated workplaces, those lacking supervisory responsibilities, and those who were ever assaulted at work--applied the label sexual harassment to . . . less serious behavior. (p. 93)

It was discovered that the male and female respondents of the Harvard Business Review (HBR) survey agreed about which extreme situations constitute sexual harassment but differed over the more ambiguous ones (Collins and Blodgett, 1981). Overall, the respondents found both types of behavior quite offensive. Additionally, the men and women differed strongly on how frequently sexual harassment occurs. Responses to a vignette containing the following content: ". . . the man kisses the woman every time they meet . . ." (p. 81), revealed that somewhat more males than females proportionately rated the action objectionable whether it was supervisor-initiated or co-worker-initiated. Also, "in response to two other statements that were more conventionally social--where the man often offers to drive the woman home and where the married man and the woman have dinner together and go to a nightclub while on a business trip" (p. 81) slightly more males than females also considered these actions as possible harassment. Collins and Blodgett explain these findings by suggesting that perhaps females are often more conscious of social conventions and, at least in the first instance, tend to accept this kind of behavior from supervisors, whereas men are more likely to consider such behaviors as merely (social-sexual) encounters between the sexes.

Gutek and her associates (1980) conducted a random telephone survey of 399 adult workers to explore the various aspects of social-sexual behaviors in the workplace. The researchers discovered that females were more likely than males to define various social-sexual behaviors as sexual harassment. Twenty-five percent of the males did not believe that dating as a condition of work is sexual harassment, whereas 14 percent of the females thought likewise. In terms of nonverbal social-sexual behaviors, 65.5 percent of the females and 3.5 percent of the

males thought such behaviors constitute sexual harassment. These findings were attributed to sex differences in socialization, power, and organizational position since they "may combine to facilitate male reports of social-sexual encounters as primarily ego-enhancing, whereas females report both ego-enhancing and harassing social-sexual encounters" (p. 265).

To summarize the findings in the area of actions constituting sexual harassment, some discrepancy does exist in terms of people's perception of which types of actions constitute sexual harassment. Specific types of behaviors have been identified as constituting sexual harassment; however, it has been pointed out that most studies have not directly asked female workers to identify behaviors and/or situations constituting sexual harassment. What is known with some degree of certainty is that females tend to identify more kinds of behaviors and/or situations as sexual harassment than do males. Further, males and females differ in their perceptions of the frequency and types of sexual harassment that actually occur in the workplace. Such findings are attributed to sex differences in socialization, power, and organizational position. Behaviors constituting sexual harassment appear to form a continuum ranging from subtle to coercive sexual approaches which are generally repetitive or frequent in nature. Also, behavior perceived as harassment (other than coercive sex) are apparently highly variable and dependent on situational factors and respondent characteristics. In studying the nature and prevalence of sexual harassment, the use of informal and formal surveys has proven to be informative.

Physiological and Psychological Consequences  
of Sexual Harassment

It has been reported that women may feel flattered by sexual advances in the initial stages (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981); however, overall, sexual harassment takes an emotional toll on the victim (Oshinsky, 1980). Oshinsky reports that "the overwhelming feeling is that of helplessness" (p. 10). Supportive of this finding is Lindsey's (1977) research on sexual harassment at the workplace. She discovered in her discourses with female victims that ". . . women have often suffered sexual harassment in silence, assuming that nothing could be done, that it was their personal dilemma, that they were somehow at fault for not being able to avoid it, or even that it was somehow an inevitable part of a 'woman's lot'" (p. 50). Apparently, it is this "feeling of helplessness" that is most detrimental, for victims of sexual harassment have reported suffering adverse psychological and physiological effects (e.g., Bralove, 1976; Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Silverman, 1976-77).

Perhaps, females have tended to suffer sexual harassment in silence because they have been socialized to do so and, more importantly, they feel guilty because they believe that they, and not their offenders, are to blame for the harassment (e.g., Bralove, 1976). Reportedly, some females have admitted that they may have unconsciously invited improper advances (Bralove, 1976). In fact, Bralove has pointed out that for every female who has been harassed "the initial feeling is that there is something wrong with me" (p. 1). Further, women are reluctant to talk about their sexual harassment experiences for fear of losing their jobs (Kelber, 1977). They are also reluctant to confide in each other because of fear of reprimand or of being misunderstood (Pogrebin, 1977). In support of such findings, Jensen and Gutek (1982) discovered in their



research on the occurrence of sexual harassment among female workers that "women who have traditional sex-role beliefs are more likely to blame themselves and other victims of being sexually harassed," that victims who blame themselves for the harassment are less likely than other victims to report the incident or to talk to someone about it, and that males are more likely than females to blame females for being sexually harassed (p. 21).

Whether female victims choose to report or tolerate sexual harassment, the literature suggest that they suffer consequences quite akin to those of rape victims (Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979). Feelings of guilt, humiliation, anger, fear, and degradation are common denominators (MacKinnon, 1979; Renick, 1980). Other reported psychological reactions include diminished ambition, depression, strained relationships with spouses, and impaired job performance (e.g., Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Lindsey, 1977; Oshinsky, 1980). Psychosomatic responses such as emotional agitation, frustration, loss of appetite, excessive crying, migraine headaches, back and neck pains, and stomach ailments, are not uncommon (e.g., Lindsey, 1977; Silverman, 1976-77).

In studying attributions and assignment of responsibility regarding sexual harassment, Jensen and Gutek (1982) suggest that "the knowledge that victims have negative emotional reactions is not as likely to impress employers as the fact that those emotional reactions have work-related consequences" (p. 130). In a follow-up interview ascertaining whether feelings toward work had been adversely affected, "analyses revealed significant relationships between reports of feelings of the negative affect items—hurt, sadness, depression, anxiety, anger, and disgust—and an item measuring negative attitude toward the job—loss

of motivation, feeling distracted, and dreading to go to work" (p. 130). Thus, if a victim reported having experienced any negative affect, she was also as equally likely to report having experienced impaired job performance, as well as negative physical effects.

To briefly diverge, the literature on male victims suggests that males may not have the same cognitive set as females in reacting to sexual harassment (e.g., Gutek, Kakamura, Gahart, and Handschumacher, 1980). Perhaps this is why a set response pattern to sexual harassment does not exist for male victims. It has been found that male victims are more likely to be flattered by sexual behavior, that such behavior is ego-enhancing for males, that the principal problems for male victims "may be to overcome bewilderment and the immobilizing effect of violent fantasies", and that males tend to find even minor types of female sexual advances disconcerting (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Gutek et al. 1980; Littler-Bishop, Seidler-Feller and Opaluch, 1982; Rowe, 1981, p. 44). These findings are explained in a socialization conceptual framework. Further, this particular sex-role reversal may become more common with time and thus, it is probable that males may become (more) enlightened in terms of the overall ramifications of sexual harassment.

To summarize, sexual harassment produces an overwhelming feeling of helplessness in its victim. Apparently, this feeling is debilitating for victims have reported suffering adverse psychological and physiological reactions which are quite akin to those of rape victims and which have negative work-related consequences. Females have tended to suffer sexual harassment in silence, to feel guilty because they were harassed, and to blame themselves and other victims for the harassment, particularly if they have traditional sex-role beliefs.

Also, males are more likely than females to blame females for being sexually harassed. The literature suggest that male-victim reaction to sexual harassment varies and that it is cognitively dissimilar to that of the female victim. If male-victimization becomes a common occurrence, males may become more enlightened in terms of the harassed female worker's plight.

#### Coping Strategies and the Consequences of Reporting Sexual Harassment

Some women may feel that to survive in the working world one must learn to handle whatever comes one's way, and others may think that sexual advances in organizations are too much for any person to handle alone. In fact, "most women wonder whether anything they do would make them safe from such behavior in the workplace" (Collins and Blodgett, 1981, p. 90). However, a lesser tendency to ignore sexual harassment and suffer in silence prevails since the issue of sexual harassment is currently a very controversial one (e.g., Brewer, 1982). Also, women are now turning to one another for mutual support and are learning tactics to defend themselves against future sexual harassment (e.g., Rowe, 1981). Following is an account of the coping strategies women undertake in dealing with sexual harassment and the consequences of reporting such.

Silverman's (1976-77) review of a survey of working women and sexual harassment revealed the following coping strategies: 25 percent complained to the harasser; 23 percent ignored the sexual harassment; 13 percent pretended not to notice; 12 percent complained through (company) channels; 9 percent quit their jobs; 2 percent asked for transfers; and 16 percent engaged in "other" coping strategies such as verbal responses to the harasser or co-workers (p. 19). In a survey of sexual

harassment in state government, Kalogera (1981) reported the following behavioral reactions: 26 percent reported nothing; 74 percent withdrew or avoided the person; 4 percent went along with it; 13 percent asked the man to stop; and 22 percent discussed it with a co-worker.

(Apparently, respondents were required to check as many responses as applicable.) "Not one of the respondents reported seeking outside information or assistance . . . . Also . . . respondents found it necessary to adopt a cool, guarded manner (57 percent) and to make it clear that they were either married or dating one person seriously (61 percent)" (p. 34).

In reviewing the May, 1980, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB) survey data, Livingston (1982) noted that respondents were asked to indicate response actions taken from a list of available alternatives rank ordered from most to least assertive as follows: "taking formal action, reporting to a higher authority, objecting to the harasser, avoiding the harasser, joking about the incident (and), ignoring the incident" (p. 13). Analyses indicated that "objecting" was the most frequently utilized response (46 percent). Approximately 12 percent "ignored the incident," 11 percent reported the incident to a higher authority, and only 2.5 percent took formal action. Furthermore, the data suggest that assertive action was taken when the harassment was serious and/or psychological distress resulted.

The response choices of the USMSPB survey data were found to be related to both the victim's and the offender's job status. Specifically, "victims ignored, joked with, or avoided co-workers as frequently as supervisors. However, they more frequently objected to co-workers than to supervisors . . . while more often reporting or taking formal action when

harassed by supervisors than when harassed by co-workers. . . ." (p. 12-13). Thus, as the victim's job status decreased, their use of assertive strategies increased particularly with regard to supervisor-initiated harassment.

Perhaps, it is not generally expected for lower-class or working-class females to engage in assertive coping strategies against supervisor-harassers; however, support exists for the USMSPB findings (Livingston, 1982) in that as early as 1976, Silverman (1976-77) noted that middle-class women "were somewhat more likely to ignore the situation, or attempt to change jobs, in order to avoid confrontation" (p. 18). Backhouse and Cohen (1981) noted the same finding regarding professional as well as middle-class women in their book entitled, Sexual Harassment on the Job.

One would expect for at least professional women to have more leeway in terms of protesting against sexual harassment. However, as previously noted, professional women have generally been subjected to the more subtle forms of sexual harassment (e.g., verbal suggestive remarks), and female-servitude workers have generally encountered the extreme forms of sexual harassment (e.g., physical coercion) (e.g., Backhouse and Cohen, 1981; Pogrebin, 1977; Silverman, 1976-77). Perhaps, then, professional women feel that the strategy of taking formal action against sexual harassers is unwarranted. Also, they may feel most threatened by the idea that even they are still judged as sexual objects (Silverman, 1976-77). Thus, professional women may deny the relevancy of sexual harassment. Low-status female workers may be cognitively prepared to deal with the job-related consequences (e.g., job loss) that may be incurred as a result of taking formal action, especially when, more than likely, such workers

have or will develop a work history involving repeated or constant job-shifts. Nevertheless, such differentiation among harassed low-status and professional women workers is worthy of further empirical investigation.

The strategy of ignoring sexual harassment is considered to be an ineffective response (Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979; Silverman, 1976-77). Obnoxious consequences are usually involved for those who attempt to ignore the harassment. In a survey of working women, MacKinnon pointed out that approximately 76 percent of those who ignored the harassment found that the advances intensified. Silverman, in reviewing the data of this particular survey, reported the following:

For (the) 76 percent of the respondents who tried this tactic . . . , almost one-third of these women were penalized on the job for not responding positively to the harassment. When asked why they didn't 'complain through channels,' women's responses indicated their weaknesses in the work situation. Forty-two percent felt that nothing would be done; 33 percent feared some negative consequences for themselves, varying from blame and ridicule to concrete penalties at work. For about 20 percent of the respondents, either there were no channels, or the harassing man was a part of them. (p. 19)

Perhaps, it is those overwhelming "feelings of helplessness" referred to earlier (Oshinsky, 1980) that are accountable for one adopting the strategy of ignoring sexual harassment. Indeed, women may couple this strategy with others which may signal their unavailability such as dressing down or in severely tailored clothes, wearing wedding bands, inventing fictional boyfriends, husbands, and children, and/or behaving in a very cool, reserved manner (Bralove, 1976; Backhouse and Cohen, 1981). However, as Backhouse and Cohen (1981) have noted, overall these "signals of unavailability" strategies prove to be futile in counteracting sexual harassment. Given the more concerted legal and experimental efforts which are currently being undertaken to curtail sexual harassment,

it is hoped that women may feel less the need to adopt such ineffective coping strategies.

If formal action is undertaken (such as lodging a complaint with the union or the company grievance committee), a victim must be emotionally and financially prepared for possible detrimental consequences (e.g., Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979; Pogrebin, 1977). The possible consequences of reporting sexual harassment to company officials include the following: (1) a harassed victim may encounter a negative reception (e.g., further harassment, job transfer, demotion, salary cuts, and job loss); (2) a poor letter of recommendation for future employment if the victim decides to quit her job; (3) scrutinization of the victim's moral and/or sexual history if the case is brought to court; (4) negative job evaluation; and (5) stigmatization or ostracism. Thus, as Livingston (1982) has pointed out, "the process and results of formal actions may be predominantly responsible for (its) infrequent utilization" (p. 14).

To recapitulate the findings in the area of coping strategies and the consequences of reporting sexual harassment, coping strategies range from ignoring the harassment to taking formal action. It is possible that a victim's job status decreases, her (or his) use of assertive strategies (e.g., taking formal action) increases particularly with regard to supervisor-initiated harassment. Seemingly, differentiation among harassed low-status and professional female workers exists in terms of employed coping strategies in that low-status female workers tend to take more assertive action against supervisor-initiated sexual harassment and professional women do not. The coping strategy of ignoring sexual harassment is considered to be an ineffective response even when coupled with "signal of unavailability" coping strategies. In terms of reporting

sexual harassment or taking formal action, the victim must be emotionally and financially prepared for possible detrimental consequences such as a negative reception, poor letters of recommendation, scrutinization of the victim's personal life, a negative job evaluation and stigmatization or ostracism.

#### Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Guidelines

Important contributions of established rights include the legitimization of the problem of sexual harassment and the encouragement of collective action against sexual harassment. Sexual harassment was considered to be sexual discrimination under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and, currently, "this law provides legal recourse for victims of sexual harassment in employment" (Oshinsky, 1980).

On April 11, 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) amended its guidelines on sexual discrimination, thereby reaffirming its position that "sexual harassment generates a harmful atmosphere and the employer has an affirmative duty to maintain a workplace free of sexual harassment and intimidation" (Renick, 1980, p. 661). Further, the amendment covers the areas of both unwanted physical and verbal harassment. Specifically, the EEOC guidelines hold an employer liable if a "supervisor or an agent (i.e., a fellow employee and/or a non-employee) violates... . Title VII, regardless of knowledge or any other mitigating factor" (Federal Register, 1980, No. 219). Admittedly, the 1980 EEOC guidelines are very detailed; however, such specifics are beyond the scope of this paper.

In addition to establishing standards for imposing liability, the guidelines hold employers responsible for developing programs to prevent sexual harassment in the workplace (e.g., Collins and Blodgett, 1981; Federal Resister, 1980, No. 219).



The elements of an adequate prevention program are not specified, but they would probably include the adoption and dissemination of a strong policy statement prohibiting sexual harassment, presentation of the subject in employee training materials and orientation sessions, and development and publication of procedures for handling complaints in the organization—including a range of sanctions and remedies and information about employee rights (Collins and Blodgett, 1981, p. 94).

Somers and Clementson-Mohr (1979) have asserted that policy statements identify employers' commitment to providing a workplace free of sexual harassment while simultaneously serving as a basis for employees' complaints. Also, Meyer, Berchtold, Oestreich and Collins (1981) have pointed out that an adequate prevention program "may increase victims' feelings of potency" (p. 11). Currently, however, the extent and effectiveness of prevention programs are not known (Livingston, 1982).

To briefly summarize, the legitimization of the problem of sexual harassment and the encouragement of collective action against sexual harassment are important contributions of the EEOC guidelines. The EEOC guidelines reaffirm the commission's position that sexual harassment produces a counterproductive work atmosphere and charges the employer with the responsibility to maintain a workplace free of physical and verbal sexual harassment. Also, the EEOC guidelines hold the employer liable for all sexual harassment incidents regardless of knowledge, the perpetrator's organizational status, or any other mitigating factor. Further, the employer is also responsible for developing prevention programs in the workplace. As yet, assessment of such programs is still in its initial stages.

#### A Model for Studying Reactions to Sexual Harassment

It is interesting to note that in preparation for the present study, a recent review of the literature on sexual harassment failed to

reveal a conceptual framework for studying reactions to sexual harassment. What is meant by the term reactions is the individual's subjective response toward some stimulus. That is, reactions reflect the individual's affective feelings, beliefs and ideas, and behavioral intentions toward some attitude object. More specifically, then, reactions reflect attitudes toward specific attitude objects. From a social psychological perspective regarding the concept, attitude, affective feelings refer to the affective component of an attitude (i.e., "the emotional feelings one has about the attitude object or one's like or dislike for the object"); beliefs and ideas, the cognitive component (i.e., the probabilistic judgments one has as to whether a particular object has a particular characteristic); and behavioral intentions, the behavioral or cognitive component (i.e., one's stated intentions "to perform a particular behavior with respect to the object of consideration") (Wrightsman and Deux, 1981, p. 242). Thus, reactions or social interpretations of rape or sexual harassment exist in or proceed from the individual's feelings, thoughts and experiences.

The variety of theoretical perspectives which have been developed in the area of sexual harassment (e.g., Oshinsky, 1980; Kanter, 1976; Gutek and Morasch, 1982; Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982) emphasize the causal, normative, situational and remedial factors surrounding the phenomenon of sexual harassment. The central themes of these frameworks reflect causal variables such as the differential distribution of organizational power and access to resources between the sexes (Oshinsky, 1980; Kanter, 1976; Gutek and Morasch, 1982; Tangri et al. 1982), societal differential distribution of power between the sexes (Tangri et al. 1982), gender-based cognitive processing (Kanter, 1976; Gutek and Morasch, 1982), and natural motivational processes (Tangri et al. 1982).

The literature on rape has been cited as being a viable framework from which to extrapolate in studying reactions to sexual harassment (e.g., Jensen and Gutek, 1982). It has already been noted that rape is the most extreme form of sexual harassment. Groth (1979) pointed out that rape and sexual harassment can both be meaningfully discussed under the single term of rape, given the similarity of underlying factors for each (e.g., unsolicited sexual advances). Medea and Thompson (1974) stated that "rape could be construed as a continuum of various degrees of violence with varying degrees of sexual intimacy" (p. 74). Also, legal interpretations of sexual harassment appear to be similar to those involving rape (Weber-Burdin and Rossi, 1982).

The widely held view of sexual harassment as an exercise of organizational power is an analogy taken from the literature on rape (Gutek and Morasch, 1982). This viewpoint presents rape as an exercise of power and not a form of sexual behavior in that men use their greater physical strength to force sexual intercourse on unwilling women; "likewise, in sexual harassment, according to the power differential hypothesis (which asserts that sexual harassment is the result of workplace power differences between the sexes) men use their superior organizational position to elicit sexual favors from women" (Gutek and Morasch, 1982, p. 56).

Intuitively, we know that prior learning of and previous experience with rape greatly affect one's reactions to rape. Demographic characteristics, such as job status (position, security, etc.), education or sex, are also known to affect rape attitudes (e.g., Field, 1978). Other factors known to affect rape attitudes include sex-role beliefs or orientations and just world beliefs (i.e., the tendency to believe that the world is a

just and orderly place where people are deserving of their fate) (e.g., Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Krulewitz and Payne, 1981; Smith, Keating, Hester and Mitchell, 1976). In fact, several variables have been empirically examined in the study of reactions to rape (e.g., Selby, Calhoun and Brock, 1977; Burgess and Holmstrom, 1974; Calhoun, Selby and Warring, 1976; and Jones and Aronson, 1973). However, identification with the victim or the tendency to empathize with or take the perspective of the victim is one variable which is seemingly related to most others (e.g., Krulewitz, 1981; Krulewitz and Payne, 1978; Jensen and Gutek, 1982).

### Conclusions

Given the analogies drawn between rape and sexual harassment, it is proposed that a model for studying reactions to sexual harassment can be derived from research findings regarding reactions to rape. Besides organizational power, variables of particular interest for this model are gender, sex-role orientation, just world beliefs and identification with the victim. Following, then, is an account of the research findings regarding rape attitudes and identification with the victim in relation to gender and power-laden male-female relations, sex-role orientation and just world beliefs.

### Gender and Power-Laden Male-Female Relations

Gender is considered to be one of the most important characteristics for predicting rape attitudes. Males and females differ in terms of their psychological involvement with the evaluation of various aspects of rape (e.g., rape definition and rape prediction). That is, "women and men are differentially terrorized by rape and by the potential of rape" (Krulewitz and Payne, 1978, p. 293). And thus, it is expected that men and women will evaluate a rape situation differently.

Krulowitz (1981) has pointed out that males may "have greater difficulty in identifying with a female rape victim" (p. 462). Conversely, it is suggested that females, being likely victims of rape, are more likely to "assume the attributional perspective of the rape victim to a greater extent than males" when making causal judgments about the rape situation (Calhoun, Selby and Warring, 1976, p. 517). Shaver (1970) proposed "that observers will attribute causality for events in such a way as to minimize the possibility of being held at fault, should they find themselves in a similar situation" (see Selby, Calhoun and Brock, 1977, p. 412). (This notion reminds one of the concept of fate or situational similarity in the just world literature in that concern over injustices increases greatly, as does the need to explain or make sense of such events when they have great relevancy for the observer's own fate.) Females are thus more likely to view a rape episode as the product of external factors to a greater degree than males. In contrast, males are more likely to view the same rape episode more as the product of the victim's internal characteristics (Selby, Calhoun and Brock, 1977).

Research findings are supportive of the foregoing discussion (e.g., Calhoun, Selby and Warring, 1976; Krulowitz, 1981; Krulowitz and Payne, 1978; Smith, Keating, Hester and Mitchell, 1976). The results of the Calhoun et al. study regarding the social perception of a rape victim revealed that the male respondents viewed the female victim as contributing to her rape to a significantly greater degree than the female respondents. "This sex difference is reflected in the higher mean ratings by male respondents on the degree to which the episode was caused by the behavior and by the personality of the woman (and) the

degree to which she is the kind of person who would get herself into such situations" (Calhoun et al. 1976, p. 523). Similar results were obtained in the Smith et al. study.

In her investigation of sex differences in evaluation of female and male victims, Krulewitz (1981) found that the male respondents identified much less with female victims than female respondents identified with male victims. Krulewitz offers the following interpretation for this findings:

The perceived dissimilarity (to the victim) ratings may indicate that women were better able to take the perspective of a male victim while the relative inability or failure of men to identify with female victims suggest that men were not able to take the perspective of the female. This last point may well be crucial in that female identification with both male and female victims and male identification with male victims alone are consonant with sex-role stereotypes and with power differences between women and men . . . . The relatively powerless in a society must understand both roles while the relatively powerful need only understand their own role (p. 471).

Here again is the notion of a power differential perspective in that seemingly Krulewitz considers male-female relations to be power-laden. In support of the foregoing interpretation, Krulewitz and Payne (1978) discovered in their study of attribution about rape, that female subjects were more likely than males "to identify societal reinforcement of male aggression" as one of the main causes of rape (p. 297).

In summary, gender is considered to be one of the most important variables in predicting rape attitudes. Because males and females differ in their psychological involvement with understanding rape occurrences, males are more likely to blame the female victim for being raped and are therefore unable to identify with the victim, whereas females are more likely to cite external factors such as societal reinforcement

of male aggression as causing the rape episode and, therefore, they tend to identify with female victims. Females are also able to take the perspective of male victims as are males. The latter finding is respectively attributed to the powerless having to understand both roles (of the male and female victims) and the powerful needing only to understand their own role.

### Sex-Role Orientation

The findings of Krulewitz and Payne's (1978) study indicate that sex-role attitudes or orientations affect one's evaluation of a rape situation. To illustrate, Krulewitz and Payne discussed their findings from the viewpoint that the rapist could be perceived as displaying an extreme version of stereotypical masculine sex-role behavior such as sexually active, aggressive, and opportunistic.

They suggested that this may lead to perceiving the rape as normative male-female sexual behavior, especially when force and physical violence is low . . . . They proposed, however, that this would only hold true for subjects incorporating more traditional sex-role beliefs; those with non-stereotypical attitudes towards women would be likely to view an incident as rape irrespective of the amount of force used or the subject's physical condition after the rape. (See Jensen and Gutek, 1982, p. 131)

Their proposal held true, however, only for profeminist females. The researchers conclude that "the absence of clear sex-role effects on rape certainty for males may indicate that sex-role stereotypes are shared by both male groups (Krulewitz and Payne, 1978, p. 299). Nevertheless, profeminist subjects (both male and female) cited societal reinforcement of male aggression as well as female passivity as causal in rape to a greater extent than did nonfeminists. Given the profeminists' assignment of less responsibility to the victim in causing

the rape, one would infer greater identification with the victim for such subjects than for nonfeminists.

In closing, research findings regarding sex-role attitudes and rape attitudes reveal that traditional sex-role oriented subjects such as nonfeminists perceive rape as normative male-female sexual behavior especially when force and physical violence is low. In contrast, profeminists are more likely to view an incident as rape regardless of the amount of violence or harm involved. Further, profeminists tend to assign less responsibility to the victim in causing the rape. Thus, persons adhering to traditional sex-role orientation are not expected to identify with the victim as are nontraditional sex-role oriented individuals.

#### Just World Beliefs

Lerner (see Lerner and Miller, 1978) postulated that people are motivated to believe that their environment is a just and orderly place where people usually get what they deserve. This need to believe that the world is just enables the individual to maintain confidence in the predictability of his/her environment. Therefore, just world rationalizing serves an adaptive function for the individual.

When people learn of an unfortunate incident, they are motivated to believe that the victim deserved his/her fate. Consequently, the victim is likely to be derogated. Respectable victims of rape, and particularly those who are unacquainted with their assailant, are therefore considered to be more responsible for the rape than are less respectable victims (Jones and Aronson, 1973; Smith, Keating, Hester and Herman, 1976). Empathy or identification with the victim is likely to emerge however, when observers expect to experience similar fates (see Lerner and Miller,



1978). External attributions are then made regarding the causal nature of the victim's suffering and the derogation effect does not occur. Further, identification with the victim under conditions other than perceived fate or situational similarity such as the existence of a prior relationship between victim and rapist and high attraction to the victim, also leads to fewer just world attributions (Smith, Keating, Hester and Mitchell, 1976). Thus, identification with the victim has a moderating effect on just world rationalizing.

Overall, then, people who engage in just world rationalizing believe that the world is a just and orderly place where people are deserving of their fate. Such people tend to derogate victims of unfortunate fates. Therefore, responsibility for rape occurrences is attributed to respectable victims. However, observers tend to identify with victims and attribute external factors as having caused the victim's suffering when they expect to experience similar fates. In other instances of identification with the victim besides perceived fate similarity such as prior victim and rapist acquaintanceship and high attraction to the victim, observers also tend to make less just world attributions. Just world rationalizing is thus lessened when identification with the victim occurs.

#### Implications of the Literature and Overview of Hypotheses

The recurrent theme throughout the literature is the notion that sexual harassment is an assertion of power. Most of the research conducted in this area has been exploratory and has relied almost exclusively on survey and correlational techniques and self-report data obtained mainly from actual or potential victims and observers, rather than offenders or high-authority persons. Although most existing

conceptual frameworks reflect the power structure in the workplace, they are not explicitly concerned with the assessment of reactions to sexual harassment or sexual harassment victims. Thus, empirical testing and theory development regarding reactions to sexual harassment are virtually nonexistent.

A need for a more general research effort that will clarify the separate and interconnected effects of gender, sexual orientation, and organizational status on reactions to sexual harassment is suggested in the literature. Personal prejudices, conceptualizations of sexuality, and one's organizational position may certainly affect the way a victim of sexual harassment is treated. Such factors would be expected to impose limitations on the range of just world attributions. Further, to the extent that the causal nature of sexual harassment is attributed to the differential distribution of power between the sexes, analysis of men's perceptions would certainly be a more fundamental step toward illumination and prevention than female defensiveness or adjustment. In this regard, analysis of the perceptions of those in power would also be of contributory value.

Using the presented model for studying reactions to sexual harassment, the purpose of the present study is to examine reactions to fictional supervisor-, co-worker-, and subordinate-initiated sexual harassment incidents as a function of supervisory responsibilities, gender, sex-role orientation, and just world beliefs. These effects will be tested among EEOC guidelines-management employees on outcome variables labeled identification (or empathy), affective reaction, perceived seriousness, self-confidence, fate (or situational) similarity, expectation of penalty for refusal, and coping strategy.

The constitutive definitions for the independent variables are as follows:

1. Supervisory responsibilities—a form of organizational power which refers to any respondent who has direct supervision over other employees.
2. Gender—the sex of the respondent—male or female.
3. Sex-role orientation—the sexual identity of the respondent who may be either androgynous (a term that denotes the integration of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual) (see Bem, 1977, p. 196) or non-androgynous (a term that denotes masculinity or femininity within an individual or the individual's internalization of society's sex-typed standards of desirable behavior for males and/or females) (see Bem, 1974).
4. Just world beliefs—belief (JW respondents) or nonbelief (NJW respondents) in the world being a just and orderly place where people usually get what they deserve.

The outcome variables are constitutively defined as follows:

1. Identification—a measure of identification or empathy with the victim.
2. Affective reaction—a measure of affect with regard to the offender's behavior.
3. Perceived seriousness—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the perceived seriousness of the offender's behavior.
4. Self-confidence—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the level of self-confidence at which the harassment could be handled.
5. Fate-similarity—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the perception of the likelihood of experiencing a fate similar to that of the victim.

6. Expectation of penalty for refusal—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding consciousness of unwanted sexual advances as assertions of power.
7. Coping strategy—a measure of instrumental reaction to (or behavioral intention toward) the offender's behavior and assertiveness of response.

The hypotheses to be tested consist of the following:

1. Female respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment condition.
2. Female respondents with supervisory responsibilities will identify with the victim significantly more than male respondents with supervisory responsibilities over all harassment conditions.
3. Androgynous respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than non-androgynous respondents over all harassment conditions.
4. Non-just world respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than just world respondents over all harassment conditions.
5. The mean seriousness rating of males will be significantly less than that of the female respondents over all harassment conditions.
6. The mean self-confidence rating of the androgynous female respondents will be significantly greater than that of the non-androgynous female respondents over all harassment conditions.
7. The mean expectation of penalty for refusal rating for females will be significantly greater than that of the male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment condition.

## CHAPTER II METHOD

### Subjects

A sample of 500 employees (238 females and 262 males) was randomly drawn from the University of Florida directory. Specifically, every twentieth name was taken from the directory until a total of 500 names were drawn. Thus, all classifications of employees, (e.g., career service, faculty and administrative) were included in the selection process. However, in order to limit the influence of confounding variables, employees considered to be foreign by the nature of their names and employees associated with the Department of Psychology were eliminated from the selection process.

### Design

A 2x2x2x2 factorial survey was undertaken, with gender, supervisory responsibilities (supervises other employees, does not supervise other employees) sex-role orientation (androgynous, non-androgynous), and just world beliefs (believe in a just world, do not believe in a just world) as independent variables.

### Survey Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire (Appendix A) entitled, "Appropriate Workplace Behavior Between the Sexes," was composed of demographic items, three workplace sexual harassment scenarios and identical accompanying sets of questions, the Just World Scale (Rubin and Peplau, 1975) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). The requested

demographic information included gender, highest educational level completed, occupational position and minimum educational training required for position, whether respondent supervises other employees and if so, how many, and the respondent's indication of how much sexual harassment occurs in the workplace.

Each of the fictional workplace sexual harassment incidents involved a female victim and a male offender and consisted of a supervisor-initiated harassment scenario, a co-worker-initiated harassment scenario, and a subordinate-initiated harassment scenario. For each scenario, the type of sexual harassment involved was that of a sexual proposition. Each scenario was accompanied by an identical set of questions measuring the seven outcome variables--identification, affective reaction, perceived seriousness, self-confidence, fate similarity, expectation of penalty for refusal, and coping strategy (see Appendix A).

The Just World Scale is a measure of the beliefs in a just world (Rubin and Peplau, 1975). The respondent is asked to indicate his/her degree of agreement or disagreement with the (eleven) "just" and (nine) "unjust" items on a 6-point continuum. Endorsement of the "just" items are labeled "just" and endorsement of the "unjust" items (scored negatively) are labeled "unjust." Thus, a mean score is derived for each respondent with high scores indicating an unjust orientation. For present and definitive purposes, respondents with mean scores  $\geq 3.5$  were labeled as just world believers and  $< 3.5$  as non-just world believers.

Psychometric analyses of the Just World Scale have indicated the scale to have high internal consistency (coefficient alpha equal to .80

and .81 for samples of Boston and Oklahoma University students, respectively) (Rubin and Peplau, 1975); predictive validity (Rubin and Peplau, 1973); and construct validity (Zuckerman, Gerbasi, Kravitz and Wheeler, 1974; Miller, Smith, Ferree and Taylor, 1973; Flowers [cited in Rubin and Peplau, 1975]). Additional psychometric analyses of the Just World Scale have indicated it to be correlated with the Authoritarianism or F-scale (e.g.,  $r=.56$ ; Rubin and Peplau, 1975); Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust Scale ( $r=.55$ ); the Protestant Ethic Scale ( $r=.35$ ; Lerner, 1973); and Rotter's Locus of Control Measure (with  $r$  ranging from  $-.32$  to  $.58$ ; Rubin and Peplau, 1973; Zuckerman and Gerbasi, 1975). For sex-role orientation scales, the Just World Scale has been shown to be negatively correlated with a 20-item scale of profeminist attitudes ( $r=-.24$ ,  $p<.05$ ,  $N=100$ ; Smith, Ferree and Miller, 1975), and positively correlated with a 10-item sex-role traditionalism scale ( $r=.35$ ,  $p<.001$ ; Peplau and Tyler, 1975).

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) is a measure of psychological androgyny (Bem, 1974). Androgyny is defined as the integration of both masculinity and femininity in a single individual (Bem, 1977). Thus, it is possible for an androgynous individual to be, for example, both masculine and feminine or instrumental and expressive, depending upon the situational appropriateness of these modalities. Further, an androgynous person may even blend complementary modalities in a single act.

"The BSRI is based on a theory about both the cognitive processing and the motivational dynamics of sex-typed and androgynous individuals" (Bem, 1979, p. 1047). For the BSRI, the sex-typed individual is conceptualized as one who is highly attentive to cultural prescriptions of sex-appropriate

behavior and uses such as a standard for judging his/her own behavior.

The BSRI is composed of the following three scales each of which consists of twenty personality characteristics: 1) a scale of masculinity; 2) a scale of femininity, and 3) a neutral or social desirability scale. The Social Desirability scale is completely neutral with respect to sex and serves primarily to provide a neutral context for the sex-typed scales. An individual is characterized as masculine, feminine, or androgynous as a function of the differences between his/her endorsement of the masculine and feminine, to the extent that the difference score is high, and androgynous, to the extent that the difference score is low.

Bem (1974) defines the androgyny score as the student's  $t$  ratio for "the difference between an individual's masculinity and femininity normalized with respect to the standard deviations of his or her masculinity and femininity scores" (p. 158). Thus, the greater the absolute value of the androgyny score, the more the person is sex-typed or sex-reversed (hereafter, this label will be referred to as non-androgynous) and, in contrast, the closer the androgyny score is to zero, the more the person is androgynous. For present and definitive purposes, respondents with BSRI scores less than 1 were labeled androgynous; all others (i.e., with scores  $\geq 1$ ) were labeled non-androgynous.

Psychometric analyses of the BSRI have indicated it to be both internally consistent and highly reliable (Bem, 1974). Using data from two normative samples (of students from Stanford University and Foothill Junior College) to measure the internal consistency of the BSRI,



results of coefficient alpha computed for the three scale scores revealed the following: Masculinity ( $\underline{r}=.97$  and  $.86$ , respectively); Femininity ( $\underline{r}=.80$  and  $.82$ , respectively); Neutral ( $\underline{r}=.75$  and  $.70$ , respectively). The reliability check between the two samples for the androgyny difference score was  $.85$  and  $.86$ , respectively. In determining the test-retest reliability of the BSRI, product moment correlations were computed between the first and second administrations for the scale and androgyny scores of a Stanford subsample. Results indicated high reliability over the four-week interval (Masculinity,  $\underline{r}=.90$ ; Femininity,  $\underline{r}=.90$ ; Neutral,  $\underline{r}=.93$ ). Further, the BSRI has been found to be moderately correlated with the California Psychological Inventory (CPI)--another measure of masculinity-femininity (BSRI Masculinity - CPI Males,  $\underline{r}=.42$ ; BSRI Femininity - CPI Females,  $\underline{r}=.25$ ; BSRI Androgyny - CPI Males,  $\underline{r}=.50$ ; BSRI Androgyny - CPI Females,  $\underline{r}=.30$ ).

#### Procedure

The data were collected between late November, 1983, and mid-January, 1984. Specifically, the survey data collection involved three separate identical mailing processes. The survey questionnaire was mailed in reusable campus envelopes through campus mail to each selected employee's campus address. Explanatory cover letters of solicitation and assurance of anonymity to respondents (Appendix B) accompanied the questionnaires for each mailing. The cover letter for the third and final mailing primarily served as a final reminder to encourage participation (Appendix B).

An identification number was assigned to each respondent and placed on the back of the questionnaire to identify those respondents

who had not participated by the second and/or third mailings. As briefly stated, respondents were assured anonymity and were informed that once their questionnaires were received, their names would be replaced by a non-tracable number for data analysis purposes only. Further, respondents who wished to be informed of the results of the study were informed to return their names along with their completed questionnaires (see Appendix B).

## CHAPTER III RESULTS

### Analyses

The results of the study are given in two parts: (1) brief account of the descriptive analyses; and (2) analyses of the outcome variables. The survey data collection of 271 usable questionnaires resulted in an unbalanced design. Thus, the General Linear Models procedure involving four-way univariate and multivariate analyses of variance (with the four factors being gender, supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation, and just world beliefs) was utilized in the analyses of the data (Helwig and Council, 1979; Montgomery, 1976). Wilk's criterion was referred to in reporting the probability level for the multivariate analyses of variance (Helwig and Council, 1979). Also, to obtain least square estimates of the unweighted cell or marginal means, the LS Means procedure was utilized,  $p < .05$ .

Other factors to keep in mind for interpreting the data analyses pertain to the codes and labels assigned to the outcome variables and the number of responses obtained for each outcome variable per scenario. Specifically, the outcome variables, identification, fate similarity, affective reaction, perceived seriousness, self-confidence, expectation of penalty for refusal and coping strategy, were coded IDEN, FATE, AFFECT, SERIOUS, CONFIDENCE, EXPECT and COPE, respectively. Such codes were assigned numbers 1, 2, and/or 3 to refer to the supervisor-, co-worker-, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively. For

example, IDEN 1, CONFIDENCE 2, and COPE 3 refer to the supervisor-, co-worker-, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively. Also, in some cases, N's are unequal since not every respondent answered all survey questionnaire items.

### Descriptive Analyses

The survey data collection resulted in a 54% return rate. Forty-six percent of the returned usable questionnaires were from males (N=125) and 54% were from females (N=146). Descriptive analyses revealed the following results for the males: (1) 70% had supervisory responsibilities; (2) 38% were androgynous; and (3) 72% believed in a just world. Among the females, 51% had supervisory responsibilities, 45% were androgynous, and 64% believed in a just world. Overall then, the majority of the male and female respondents had supervisory responsibilities, were non-androgynous, and believed in a just world. (For additional descriptive findings, see Appendix C.)

### Identification

Consideration was given to the possibility that initial differences may exist among the respondents in terms of the outcome variable, fate similarity, which based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "How likely is it that this could happen to you?" (see Appendix A), is operationally defined as a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the perception of the likelihood of experiencing a fate similar to that of the victim. Pearson product-moment correlations computed between the outcome variable, identification (IDEN), which based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "To what extent can you imagine how Jane (Mary or Ms. Smith) feels?" (see Appendix A), is operationally defined as a measure of identification with the victim, and fate similarity

(FATE) revealed the following: IDEN 1-FATE 1,  $r=.14$ ,  $p<.05$ ,  $N=269$ ; IDEN 2-FATE 2,  $r=.13$ ,  $p<.05$ ,  $N=269$ ; and IDEN 3-FATE 3,  $r=.16$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $N=268$  (see Appendix D). Thus, it was decided to analyze identification with fate similarity as a covariate.

Fate similarity was found to be significant as a covariate for all three scenarios as a result of performing separate univariate analyses of variance on identification (FATE 1:  $F(1,250)=5.99$ ,  $p<.05$ ; FATE 2:  $F(1,241)=5.85$ ,  $p<.05$ ; FATE 3:  $F(1,251)=8.23$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The only additional significant finding obtained for identification with fate similarity as a covariate was a four-way interaction between gender, supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation, and just world beliefs for the subordinate-initiated harassment,  $F(1,251)=3.96$ ,  $p<.05$ .

The significant four-way interaction was examined by sex-role orientation at each level of gender, supervisory responsibilities, and just world beliefs. Results of the separate univariate analyses of variance performed on IDEN 3 revealed a significant finding only for respondents who are male, without supervisory responsibilities, and who believe in a just world,  $F(1,20)=7.31$ ,  $p<.01$  (see Table 1). Specifically, significantly greater identification with the victim for the subordinate-initiated harassment was found for androgynous males with such characteristics ( $M=4.39$ ) than for non-androgynous males ( $M=2.68$ ,  $p<.01$ ; see Table 2).

Thus, the following hypotheses were not confirmed.

1. Female respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment.
2. Female respondents with supervisory responsibilities will identify with the victim significantly more than male respondents with supervisory responsibilities over all harassment conditions.

TABLE 1

Univariate Analyses of Covariance on IDEN 3 and FATE 3  
as a Covariate for Androgyny Versus Non-Androgyny  
in Terms of Gender, Supervisory Responsibilities (SR),  
and Just World Beliefs

		df	MS	F
With SR Just World Believer	Males	1	.17	.01
	Females	1	.56	.30
Without SR Just World Believer	Males	1	12.77	7.31*
	Females	1	.06	.03
With SR Non-Just World Believer	Males	1	.53	.28
	Females	1	.79	.40
Without SR Non-Just World Believer	Males	1	.99	.35
	Females	1	.27	.12

\* $p < .05$ .

TABLE 2

Comparison of Respondents for IDEN 3 with FATE 3  
as a Covariate in Terms of Mean Sex-Role Orientation  
Scores as a Function of Gender, Supervisory Responsibilities (SR),  
and Just World Beliefs

		N	Androgynous	Non-Androgynous
Males	Without SR Just World Believer*	24	4.39	2.68
	Without SR Non-Just World Believer	14	2.55	3.21
	With SR Just World Believer	66	3.78	3.74
	With SR Non-Just World Believer	21	2.93	2.74
Females	Without SR Just World Believer	42	3.18	3.27
	Without SR Non-Just World Believer	29	3.13	2.93
	With SR Just World Believer	50	3.55	3.34
	With SR Non-Just World Believer	24	3.43	3.80

\* $p < .05$ .

3. Androgynous respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than non-androgynous respondents over all harassment conditions.

4. Non-just world respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than just world respondents over all harassment conditions.

(See Appendices E and F for descriptive statistics on the cell groups.)

#### Affective Reaction

Results of multivariate analyses of variance performed on the overall affective reaction scores (AFFECT—a measure of affect with regard to the offender's behavior is based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "How do you feel about Mr. Jones' behavior?") (see Appendix A) revealed a significant three-way interaction between supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation, and just world beliefs,  $F(3,252)=2.96$ ,  $p<.05$  (see Appendix G). Hence, sex-role orientation was examined at each level of supervisory responsibilities and just world beliefs. Results of multivariate analyses of variance performed on sex-role orientation revealed significant effects on overall affective reaction scores only for respondents with and without supervisory responsibilities and who believe in a just world,  $F(3,110)=4.25$ ,  $p<.01$  and  $F(3,60)=2.90$ ,  $p<.05$ , respectively.

Results of performing separate univariate analyses of variance on sex-role orientation revealed that respondents with supervisory responsibilities and who are just world believers did not significantly differ on the mean affective reaction scores for each scenario. However, significant findings were obtained for respondents without supervisory responsibilities and who believe in a just world for AFFECT 1,



$F(1,62)=5.58$ ,  $p<.05$  and AFFECT 3,  $F(1,62)=7.99$ ,  $p<.01$ . Specifically then, androgynous respondents without supervisory responsibilities and who are just world believers had a significantly less negative reaction to the offender's behavior for both the supervisor-initiated harassment and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios than non-androgynous respondents (AFFECT 1: androgynous,  $M=2.15$ , non-androgynous,  $M=1.42$ ,  $p<.05$ ; AFFECT 3: androgynous,  $M=2.38$ , non-androgynous,  $M=1.58$ ,  $p<.01$ ). (Note that no hypotheses were formulated regarding the variable affective reaction. Also, see Appendices E and F for descriptive statistics on the cell groups.)

#### Perceived Seriousness

Multivariate analyses of variance were performed on the overall perceived seriousness scores. SERIOUS—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the perceived seriousness of the offender's behavior is based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "Please rate the seriousness of Mr. Jones' (John's or Paul's) behavior" (see Appendix A) and results revealed a significant effect only for gender,  $F(3,248)=3.10$ ,  $p<.05$ . Ignoring the multivariate criterion of significant ( $p.0166$ ) separate univariate analyses of variance were performed on SERIOUS and results revealed a significant effect for gender only in the supervisor-initiated and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios,  $F(1,250)=5.82$ ,  $p<.05$  and  $F(1,250)=7.53$ ,  $p<.01$ , respectively. Examination of the least square means revealed that for SERIOUS 1 and SERIOUS 3 females' mean seriousness score regarding the offender's behavior was significantly greater than that of the male respondents (females,  $M=4.72$ , males,  $M=4.45$ ,  $p<.05$ ; females,  $M=4.29$ , males,  $M=3.86$ ,  $p<.01$ , respectively). Thus, hypothesis 5 which reads, "The mean seriousness rating for males will be significantly less than that of the female respondents over all harassment conditions,"

was partially confirmed for the supervisor-initiated and the subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios. (See Appendices E and F for descriptive statistics on the cell groups.)

### Self-Confidence

No significant effects were found for the overall self-confidence scores. (CONFIDENCE—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the perceived ease with which the harassment could be handled is based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "Please rate the ease with which you could handle Mr. Jones' (John's or Paul's) behavior" (see Appendix A) as a result of performing multivariate analyses of variance. Allowing for an error rate increase of .15, separate univariate analyses of variance were performed on self-confidence and results revealed a significant effect only for the co-worker-initiated and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios. For CONFIDENCE 2, sex-role orientation was found to be significant,  $F(1,251)=4.49$ ,  $p<.05$ . Androgynous respondents' mean rating on self-confidence was significantly greater than that of non-androgynous respondents ( $M_s=4.05$  and  $3.67$ ,  $p<.05$ , respectively).

For the subordinate-initiated harassment scenario, a significant three-way interaction between gender, supervisory responsibilities, and sex-role orientation was obtained,  $F(1,251)=4.96$ ,  $p<.05$ . Gender was then examined at each level of supervisory responsibilities and sex-role orientation for CONFIDENCE 3. Findings obtained as a result of performing separate univariate analyses of variance indicated a significant gender effect only for respondents with supervisory responsibilities and who are androgynous in their sexual orientation,  $F(1,67)=5.40$ ,  $p<.05$  (see Table 3). In this respect, the CONFIDENCE 3 mean rating for females ( $M=4.51$ ) was significantly greater than that of males ( $M=3.78$ ),  $p<.05$ . Therefore, insufficient evidence was found to support hypothesis 6 which

TABLE 3

Univariate Analyses of Variance Performed on  
Self-Confidence 3 Scores for Gender as a  
Function of Supervisory Responsibilities (SR)  
and Sex-Role Orientation

		df	MS	F
Androgynous	With SR N=71	1	7.46	5.40*
	Without SR N=42	1	1.73	1.15
Non-Androgynous	With SR N=90	1	.53	.55
	Without SR N=67	1	.54	.58

\* $p < .05$ .

is stated as follows: "The mean self-confidence rating of the androgynous female respondents will be significantly greater than that of the non-androgynous female respondents over all harassment conditions."

(See Appendices E and F for descriptive statistics on the cell groups.)

#### Expectation of Penalty for Refusal

A significant two-way interaction between gender and sex-role orientation was obtained as a result of performing multivariate analyses of variance on the overall expectation of penalty for refusal scores (EXPECT—a measure of cognitive reaction regarding the consciousness of unwanted sexual advances as assertions of power is based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "How much do you feel Jane (Mary or Ms. Smith) will be penalized on the job if she continues to refuse Mr. Jones (John or Paul)?" (see Appendix A)),  $F(3,241)=4.63$ ,  $p<.01$ . Sex-role orientation was then examined at each level of gender. A significant overall sex-role orientation effect was obtained only for male respondents  $F(3,109)=3.68$ ,  $p<.05$ . In this regard, separate univariate analyses of variance revealed a significant finding only for the supervisor-initiated harassment scenario,  $F(1,111)=9.62$ ,  $p<.01$ . Specifically, androgynous male respondents' mean rating of expectation of penalty for refusal was significantly greater than that of non-androgynous male respondents ( $M_s=3.88$  and  $3.01$ ,  $p<.01$ , respectively).

Further results of the univariate analyses performed on EXPECT revealed sex-role orientation to be significant only for the subordinate-initiated harassment for female respondents,  $F(1,132)=4.34$ ,  $p<.05$ . For this type of initiator-harassment, non-androgynous female respondents had a significantly greater mean expectation of penalty for refusal rating than the androgynous female respondents ( $M_s=1.57$  and  $1.26$ ,  $p<.05$ ,

respectively. Thus, support was not obtained for hypothesis 7 which reads, "The mean expectation of penalty for refusal rating for females will be significantly greater than that of the male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment condition." (See Appendices E and F for descriptive statistics on the cell groups.)

#### Coping Strategy

Since respondents sometimes checked more than one response for the questionnaire item measuring coping strategy (COPE-a measure of instrumental reaction to (or behavioral intention toward) the offender's behavior and assertiveness of response, is based on responses to the survey questionnaire item, "What would you do about Mr. Jones' behavior?" (see Appendix A)) it was decided to analyze the data for coping strategy as a function of the summation of responses indicated by each respondent. Therefore, coping strategy is more meaningfully interpreted as a measure of the number of instrumental reactions to (or behavioral intentions toward) the offender's behavior.

Significant effects were not obtained as a result of performing multivariate analyses of variance on the overall coping strategy scores. However, (ignoring the multivariate criterion of significance ( $p < .05$ )) separate univariate analyses of variance performed on coping strategy revealed significant results for all three scenarios. Specifically, for COPE 1 and COPE 2, a significant two-way interaction between supervisory responsibilities and sex-role orientation was obtained,  $F(1,248)=5.17$ ,  $p < .05$  and  $F(1,248)=5.41$ ,  $p < .05$ , respectively (see Appendix H). Examination of supervisory responsibilities at each level of sex-role orientation for COPE 1 and COPE 2 revealed significance only for androgynous respondents,  $F(1,105)=4.36$ ,  $p < .05$  and  $F(1,105)=8.28$ ,  $p < .01$ , respectively

(see Table 4). Results of the IS Means procedure performed on the two-way interaction revealed that the mean coping strategy score of the androgynous respondents without supervisory responsibilities was significantly greater than that of androgynous respondents with supervisory responsibilities (COPE 1:  $\bar{M}$ s=5.34 and 4.88,  $p < .05$ , respectively; COPE 2:  $\bar{M}$ s=5.26 and 4.67,  $p < .01$ , respectively).

For COPE 3, sex-role orientation was found to be significant,  $F(1,248)=4.53$ ,  $p < .05$ . Examination of the IS Means procedure performed on this main effect, revealed that the mean coping strategy score of androgynous respondents was significantly greater than that of non-androgynous respondents ( $\bar{M}$ s=5.22 and 4.84,  $p < .05$ , respectively). (Note that the hypotheses to be tested did not include any regarding the variable coping strategy. Also, see Appendices E and F for descriptive statistics on the cell groups.)

### Summary of Results

A. The following hypotheses were not confirmed:

1. Female respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment condition.
2. Female respondents with supervisory responsibilities will identify with the victim significantly more than male respondents with supervisory responsibilities over all harassment conditions.
3. Androgynous respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than non-androgynous respondents over all harassment conditions.
4. Non-just world respondents will identify with the victim significantly more than just world respondents over all harassment conditions.

TABLE 4

Univariate Analyses of Variance on COPE 1 and  
COPE 2 for Supervisory Responsibilities  
as a Function of Sex-Role Orientation

		df	MS	F
Androgynous N=113	COPE 1	1	4.63	4.36*
	COPE 2	1	7.38	8.28**
Non-Androgynous N=158	COPE 1	1	2.01	1.74
	COPE 2	1	.54	.39

\* $p < .05$ .

\*\* $p < .01$ .

5. The mean self-confidence rating of the androgynous female respondents will be significantly greater than that of the non-androgynous female respondents over all harassment conditions.

B. Insufficient evidence was obtained to support the following hypothesis:

The mean expectation of penalty for refusal rating for females will be significantly greater than that of the male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment condition.

C. The following hypothesis was partially confirmed for the supervisor-initiated and the subordinate-initiated harassment:

The mean seriousness rating for males will be significantly less than that of the female respondents over all harassment conditions.

D. Specific significant findings:

1. Significantly greater identification with the victim for the subordinate-initiated harassment (with fate similarity as a covariate) was found for androgynous males without supervisory responsibilities and who believe in a just world than for non-androgynous males with the same characteristics.
2. Androgynous respondents without supervisory responsibilities who are just world believers had a significantly less negative reaction to the offender's behavior for both the supervisor-initiated and the subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios than non-androgynous respondents with the same characteristics.
3. Female respondents' mean seriousness score regarding the (perceived seriousness of the) offender's behavior was significantly greater than that of the male respondents for the supervisor-initiated



- and the subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios.
4. Androgynous respondents' mean self-confidence rating for the co-worker-initiated harassment scenario was significantly greater than that of non-androgynous respondents.
  5. The mean self-confidence score of androgynous females with supervisory responsibilities for the subordinate-initiated harassment scenario was significantly greater than that of the androgynous males with supervisory responsibilities.
  6. Androgynous male respondents' mean rating of expectation of penalty for refusal was significantly greater than that of non-androgynous male respondents for the supervisor-initiated harassment scenario.
  7. Non-androgynous female respondents' mean expectation of penalty for refusal score for the subordinate-initiated harassment was significantly greater than that of the androgynous female respondents.
  8. The mean coping strategy scores of androgynous respondents without supervisory responsibilities for the supervisor-initiated and co-worker-initiated harassment scenarios were significantly greater than those of androgynous respondents with supervisory responsibilities.
  9. The mean coping strategy score of androgynous respondents for the subordinate-initiated harassment was significantly greater than that of non-androgynous respondents.

#### CHAPTER IV DISCUSSION

The topic, sexual harassment, is a sensitive issue. Judging by the various incidents which occurred throughout the survey (e.g., hostile reactions—both written, called in, and personally delivered and concern regarding the survey's authenticity), it is believed that the surveyed employees were sensitive to the nature of the topic under investigation. It is not known, of course, how persons who chose not to participate in the survey differed from those who did.

It can only be assumed that the 271 respondents were more willing to participate, more interested in the issue, and felt less threatened regarding the protection of their identities. Judging by the descriptive findings, these respondents are considered to be a representative sample both in terms of University-demographic characteristics and the research variables of interest.

Out of all of the main effects, gender was definitely expected to be significant for identification with the victim and particularly in the case of the supervisor-initiated harassment scenario. It was expected that female respondents would be sufficiently aroused and threatened by the very nature of the scenario itself given the organizational power differences and the type of harassment involved.

It is very possible that failure to elicit differential identification with the victim was due to the nature of the questionnaire item. That is, perhaps, it was the wording of the questionnaire item that

was faulty in this regard. Lerner and Miller (1978) have pointed out that "... it is not uncommon . . . that researchers who wish to test the reactions of people . . . often employ procedures that fail to create the level of involvement or realism necessary to evoke the process of interest . . . " (p. 1048-1049). Perhaps a more direct questionnaire item (e.g., "Imagine yourself in this situation as Jane (Mary or Ms. Smith). To what extent can you imagine how she feels?") would have elicited at least significant female identification with the victim.

Consideration must also be given to the possibility that failure to elicit differential identification with the victim was due to the invalidity of the hypotheses. Perhaps female- and/or male-identification with victims of rape occurs because the phenomenon is so blatant. However, the type of sexual harassment involved in this survey is not nearly as blatant as rape and thus it can be subjectively interpreted.

Interestingly enough, is the significant male-identification with the victim in the case of the subordinate-initiated harassment scenario. It is conceivable that these androgynous males who are just world believers and are without supervisory responsibilities may have misinterpreted the intent of the fate similarity item. That is, they may have interpreted the questionnaire item both from the victim's and the offender's perspectives. (Recall that the fate similarity item is stated as follows: "How likely is it that this could happen to you?").

To the extent that misinterpretation of the fate similarity item was likely, it is suggested that these males being androgynous in their sexual orientation were cognitively aware of the role reversals in the scenario both in terms of power and gender. They were therefore sensitive and compassionate toward the female supervisor's predicament.

They were analytical and perceptive enough to realize that the male offender had assimilated the female's supervisory work-role into pre-existing generalizations concerning sex-role stereotypes (e.g., women as sex-objects; Kanter, 1976; Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982). Though extreme job-related reprisals may not have been expected for the female supervisor, these male respondents nevertheless may have expected the sexual harassment to be particularly trying for the victim. Hence, dispositional attributions were probably made regarding the offender's behavior in the sense that he was perceived as exerting more effort in sexually harassing his female boss. Such factors coupled with the facts that these males are also just world believers and the significance of fate similarity as a covariate are considered to have contributed to the emergence of identification with the victim in this instance.

The identification finding is further significant since it represents a departure from previous experimental findings pertaining to the absence of male identification with the female victim (Krulowitz, 1981). However, it is in agreement with Krulowitz's study in that one set of the powerless (respondents) in the survey are these particular males who were able to understand both the role of the powerful in our society (i.e., males, in general) and that of the powerless (females, in general). All in all, the androgynous male may be the enlightened male in terms of perceiving and interpreting the overall ramifications of sexual harassment.

Sex-role orientation and the belief in a just world may both attenuate the effect of an absence of organizational power (i.e., supervisory responsibilities) in terms of respondents' affective reactions and coping strategies toward the offender's behavior. That is,

whether respondents have supervisory responsibilities or not, androgynous respondents who believe in a just world may feel confident in handling the offender for all three scenarios. It has been noted that just world believers are more oriented toward the internal control of reinforcements or have a stronger sense of personal or internal control over one's outcomes (Rubin and Peplau, 1975). Further, androgynous individuals are usually assertive and instrumental in their daily activities. Therefore, it is not surprising that such respondents were less negative in their affective reactions toward the offender's behavior than non-androgynous respondents without supervisory responsibilities and who believe in a just world. These androgynous respondents may not feel powerless or helpless in coping with sexual harassment.

Essentially, androgynous individuals may be stronger people who probably have higher expectations and aspirations for a satisfying work environment and may actually behave in such fashion. This is definitely reflected in the finding regarding coping strategy in that androgynous respondents indicated a significantly greater number of behavioral intentions toward sexual harassment even if they are without organizational power. Such intentions surely included assertive coping strategies for both the supervisor-initiated and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios wherein clearly organizational and gender power differences exist and escalating confrontations are expected.

Although it was originally intended to test the assertiveness of the indicated coping strategy on the basis of gender, supervisory responsibilities, sex-role orientation and just world beliefs, it is believed that relevant information was nevertheless obtained even

though the variable was operationally redefined. It can be reasonably assumed that judging from respondents' indications, that assertive coping strategies (e.g., take formal action) would be employed along with what would be considered non-assertive coping strategies such as avoiding the offender. In fact, androgynous respondents probably indicated that they would take assertive action and non-assertive action which would alleviate the harassment or keep the offender at bay so to speak, until some positive measure is taken to correct the situation.

The survey findings reflected organizational power differences and power-laden male-female relations were in agreement with previous experimental results (e.g., Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982, Collins and Blodgett, 1981). Several results sound the recurrent theme throughout the literature that sexual harassment is an assertion of power. Such results include the following: (1) significant female- (as opposed to male-) perceived seriousness for the supervisor- and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios; (2) significant androgynous- (as opposed to non-androgynous-) self-confidence for the co-worker-initiated harassment scenario; (3) significant androgynous male- (as opposed to non-androgynous male-) expectation of penalty for refusal for the supervisor-initiated harassment scenario; and (4) significant non-androgynous female- (as opposed to androgynous female-) expectation of penalty for refusal for the subordinate-initiated harassment scenario.

Given the foregoing, the non-androgynous male may not be conscious of or as apt to verbalize his feelings regarding sexual harassment as an act of power. As for the androgynous female, the perceived seriousness of the offender's behavior was not significant.

However, this finding is in keeping with previous experimental results or suggestions that the more male-identified or androgynous a female is, the less likely she is to be intimidated by power-based sexual advances. Thus, such a female is less likely to consider sexual harassment a problem which cannot be overcome. An androgynous female is more likely to feel confident in handling sexual harassment and is not threatened by the possibility of job-related penalties for refusal. She is motivated to survive in workplaces wherein women may be viewed as sexual objects first and work-role occupants second.

In summary, it is very likely that the sampled employees were sensitive to the nature of the topic in question and were thus concerned regarding the possible disclosure of their identities. Overall failure to elicit identification with the victim may be attributable to the wording of the questionnaire item or the invalidity of the hypotheses. Based on the survey results, the androgynous male respondents may be enlightened males in terms of perceiving and interpreting the overall ramifications of sexual harassment. It is also believed that an androgynous and just world orientation may have resulted in less negative reactions and greater coping strategies toward the offender's behavior. Also, the survey finding regarding organizational power differences and power-laden male-female relations were considered to be in agreement with previous experimental results.

### Conclusions

The research model is considered to be a viable one, even though identification with the victim did not occur with this study as expected. Extrapolating from the literature on rape in developing the model was enlightening in terms of illustrating the interconnected

effects of gender, sexual orientation, organizational status, and personal prejudices, with regard to assessing reactions to sexual harassment. The various significant interactions found in this study are testimonial in this regard. Insight was also gained regarding males' perceptions on the subject of reactions to sexual harassment, particularly with regard to androgynous males. Further, information gained regarding the powerless' (i.e., those without organizational power or supervisory responsibilities) reactions to sexual harassment indicated such respondents do not necessarily feel powerless or helpless in coping with sexual harassment.

Evaluative data has also been gained regarding perceptions of workers who are employed under a managerial system which has promoted the EEOC guidelines for some time. The university's managerial system is very public with the guidelines and periodically informs its employees of their rights. In this regard, respondents' feelings of potency were reflected in the survey results.

The findings regarding sexual orientation seem to indicate that such transcends the effects of personal prejudices and organizational status. Thus, it is suggested that a move toward androgynous management would be most effective in creating support systems to facilitate changes in organizational male-female relations, as well as in preventing sexual harassment. This suggestion is not made without regard to the finding pertaining to a significantly less negative reaction to the offender's behavior for androgynous respondents as opposed to non-androgynous respondents. As previously proposed, an androgynous orientation may be accompanied with assertive behavior and a stronger sense of feeling in control of one's outcomes. Therefore, androgynous



individuals may be most effective in desensitizing sex-typed individuals to sexual harassment.

As previously alluded, androgynous individuals differ from sex-typed individuals in their cognitive structures for coding and processing information regarding gender and gender differences (see Bem, 1979). It is believed that androgynous individuals are more insightful regarding gender prejudices and gender differences and use such information more readily than sex-typed individuals as the basis of personality attributions and predictive inferences. Conceivably then, androgynous individuals probably use such information in making causal inferences about a variety of behavioral outcomes related to male-female relations such as sexual harassment. Given that androgynous individuals' cognitive processing is more sensitive to the sexual aspects of the sex-role versus the work-role of the female, it is believed that they would provide a more receptive managerial climate for the handling of sexual harassment complaints and for the development and presentation of the subject in employee-training materials and orientation sessions

#### Implications for Future Research

It is likely that the return rate would have been greater if better identity-protection measures had been undertaken. Although anonymity was assured, numbers were written on the back cover of the questionnaire to facilitate the second and third mailings. Perhaps a better strategy for alleviating concerns of anonymity is the use of the matrix method or invisible ink.

If coping strategy, as examined in this survey, is studied in future research it is suggested that respondents should be instructed to rank order their responses. Hence, research questions such as

whether respondent-indication of the use of assertive coping strategies is a function of the victim's and/or offender's organizational status could thus be answered.

A possible limitation of this survey may have been the use of single-questionnaire items to assess the outcome variable. For future research, it is proposed that the use of multiple-questionnaire items for assessing each dependent measure may provide informative data regarding the cognitive processes of respondents when confronted with sexual harassment issues.

Worthwhile future experimental investigations to undertake may include the effectiveness of an androgynous management in counteracting sexual harassment. Such an investigation may involve role-playing and the study of male-female communication processes. The results of studying such processes may be informative in terms of illustrating means for men and women to discuss sexual harassment in non-defensive ways. Also, insight may be gained regarding how men and women may sometimes misinterpret the dynamics of their social interactions as sexual attraction and implicit misuse of organizational power.

To recapitulate, suggestions for future research on reactions to workplace sexual harassment include the following: (1) the use of identity-protection measures such as the matrix method or invisible ink in order to alleviate anonymity concerns; (2) explicit instructions for rank-order questionnaire items; and (3) the use of multiple-questionnaire items for assessing each dependent measure. Also, the study of the effectiveness of an androgynous management in counteracting sexual harassment is considered to be worthy of investigation.

# REFERENCES

- Abramson, J. Old boys new women: the politics of sex discrimination. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979.
- Backhouse, C., & Cohen, L. Sexual harassment on the job. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981.
- Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(2), 155-162.
- Bem, S.L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45(2), 196-205.
- Bem, S.L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: a reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colter critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37(6), 1047-1054.
- Benson, D.J., & Thomson, G.E. Sexual harassment on a university campus: the confluence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. Social Problems, 1982, 29, 236-251.
- Bralove, M. A cold shoulder: career women decry sexual harassment by bosses and clients. The Wall Street Journal, January, 1976, 1, 15.
- Brandenburg, J.B. Sexual harassment in the university: guidelines for establishing a grievance procedure. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1982, 8(2), 320-336.
- Brewer, M.B. Further beyond nine to five: an integration and future directions. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 34(4), 149-158.
- Brewer, M.B., & Berk, R.A. Beyond nine to five: sexual harassment on the job. Introduction and overview. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 1-4.
- Bularzik, M. Sexual harassment at the workplace: historical notes. Radical America, 1978, 12(4), 15-43.
- Burgess, A.A., & Holmstrom, L.L. Rape trauma syndrome. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1974, 131(9), 981-986.
- Calhoun, L.G., Selby, J.W., & Warring, L.J. Social perception of the victim's causal role in rape: an exploratory examination of four factors. Human Relations, 1976, 29(6), 517-526.

- Collins, E.G.C., & Blodgett, T.B. Sexual harassment . . . some see it. . . some won't. Harvard Business Review, 1981, 59, 76-95.
- Crocker, P.L. An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1983, 8(4), 696-707.
- Farley, L. Sexual shakedown: the sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Federal Register. Title IX educational amendments, 1975, 40(155).
- Federal Register. Discrimination because of sex under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; adoption of final interpretive guidelines, 1980, 45(219).
- Fields, H.S. Attitudes toward rape: a comparative analysis of police, rapist, crisis counselors, and citizens. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36(2), 156-179.
- Groth, A.N. Men who rape: the psychology of the offender. New York: Plenum Press, 1979.
- Gutek, B.A., Kakamura, C.Y., Gahart, M., & Handschumacher, I. Sexuality and the workplace. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1980, 1(3), 255-265.
- Gutek, B.A., & Morasch, B. Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 55-64.
- Helwig, J.T., & Council, K.A. (Eds.) SAS user's guide. Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, 1979.
- Jensen, I.W., & Gutek, B.A. Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 121-136.
- Jones, C., & Aronson, E. Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26(3), 415-419.
- Kalogera, L.S. Sexual harassment in state government. Access—A Human Services Magazine, April-May, 1981, pp. 32-34.
- Kanter, R.M. Some effects of proportions on group life: skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. American Journal of Sociology, 1976, 82(5), 965-990.
- Kelber, M. Sexual harassment is the U.N.'s dirty little secret. Ms. Magazine, 1977, p. 51.

- Kruelewitz, J.E. Sex differences in evaluations of female and male victims' responses to assault. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1981, 1(5), 460-474.
- Kruelewitz, J.E., & Payne, E.J. Attributions about rape: effects of rapist force, observer sex and sex-role attitudes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1978, 8(4), 191-305.
- Lerner, M.J. Belief in a just world versus the authoritarian syndrome: but nobody liked the Indians. Unpublished manuscript, University of Waterloo, 1973.
- Lerner, M.J., & Miller, D.T. Just world research and the attribution process: looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85(5), 1030-1051.
- Lindsey, K. Sexual harassment on the job and how to stop it. Ms. Magazine, 1977, pp. 47-48.
- Littler-Bishop, S., Seidler-Feller, D., & Opaluch, R.E. Sexual harassment in the workplace as a function of initiator's status: the case of airline personnel. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 137-148.
- Livingston, J.A. Responses to sexual harassment on the job: legal, organizational, and industrial actions. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 5-22.
- MacKinnon, C.A. Sexual harassment of working women. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Medea, C., & Thompson, K. Against rape. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1974.
- Meyer, M.C., Berchtold, I.M., Oestreich, J.L., & Collins, F.G. Sexual Harassment. New York: Petrocelli Books, 1981.
- Miller, F.D., Smith, E.R., Ferree, M.M., & Taylor, S.E. Innocence, culpability, and identification with the victim: a balance theory interpretation of the just world. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1973.
- Montgomery, D.C. Design and analysis of experiments. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.
- Oshinsky, J.C. Sexual harassment of women students in higher education (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 42, 555A. (University Microfilms No. 81-15663).
- Peplau, L.A., & Tyler, T. Belief in a just world and political attitudes. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Sacramento, April, 1975.

- Pogrebin, L.C. Sex harassment. Ladies Home Journal, June, 1977, pp. 24-28.
- Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., Dull, V., & Bartlett, K. The factorial survey: an approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 99-110.
- Renick, J.C. Sexual harassment at work: why it happens, what to do about it. Personnel Journal, 1980, 59(8), 658-662.
- Rotter, J.B. A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. Journal of Psychology, 1967, 35, 651-665.
- Rowe, M.P. Dealing with sexual harassment. Harvard Business Review, 1981, 59(3), 42-46.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L.A. Who believes in a just world? Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31(3), 65-89.
- Schneider, B.E. Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 75-98.
- Selby, J.W., Calhoun, L.G., & Brock, T.A. Sex differences in the social perception of rape victims. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, 412-415.
- Sexual harassment lands companies in court. Business Week, October 1, 1979, p. 120.
- Seymour, W.C. Sexual harassment: finding a cause of action under Title VII. Labor Law Journal, 1979, 30(3), 139-156.
- Shaver, K.G. Redress and conscientiousness in the attribution of responsibility for accidents. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1970, 6, 100-110.
- Silverman, D. Sexual harassment: working women's dilemma. Quest: A Feminist Quarterly, 1976-77, 3(3), 15-24.
- Skrocki, M.R. Sexual pressures on the job. McCalls, March, 1978, p. 43.
- Smith, R.E., Keating, J.P., Hester, K.K., & Mitchell, H.E. Role and justice considerations in the attribution of responsibility to a rape victim. Journal of Research in Personality, 1976, 10, 346-357.
- Somers, P.A., & Clementson-Mohr, J. Sexual extortion in the workplace. The Personnel Administrator, 1979, 24(4), 23-28.
- Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R., & Johnson, L.B. Sexual harassment at work: three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 33-54.

- Vogelmann-Sine, S., Ervin, E.D., Christensen, R., Warmusun, C.H., & Ullmann, L.P. Sex differences in feelings attributed to a woman in situations involving coercion and sexual advances. Journal of Personality, 1979, 47(3), 420-431.
- Weber-Burdin, E., & Rossi, P.H. Defining sexual harassment on campus: a replication and extension. Journal of Social Issues, 1982, 38(4), 111-120.
- White, S. The office pass. Across the Board, April, 1977, 17-20.
- Wolf, W.C., & Fligstein, N.D. Sexual stratification: differences in power in the work setting. Social Forces, 1979, 58, 94-107.
- Wrightsmann, L.S., & Deux, K. (Eds.) Social psychology in the 80's. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1981.
- Zuckerman, M., & Gerbasi, K.C. Belief in internal control or belief in a just world: a reinterpretation of behavioral and attitudinal correlates of the I-E Scale. Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester, 1975.
- Zuckerman, M., Gerbasi, K.C., Kravitz, R.I., & Wheeler, L. The belief in a just world and reactions to innocent victims. Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester, 1974.

## Appropriate Workplace Behavior Between the Sexes

(1) Sex:           M           F

(2) Occupational Position \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Highest Education Level Completed: Grade Level Only

\_\_\_\_ Earned high school diploma or equivalent.

Earned Bachelor's degree

Earned Graduate or Professional degree

(4) Minimum (or lowest) degree required for your occupational position at the University of Florida: \_\_\_\_\_ High school diploma or equivalent  
\_\_\_\_\_ Bachelor's degree \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate or Professional degree

(5) Do you have supervisory responsibilities? Yes No

If yes, how many people do you supervise?

0-5      6-10      11-15      15 and above

(6) How much sexual harassment occurs in the workplace?

1 2 3 4 5  
(Not much at all) (A great amount)





APPENDIX A  
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Scenario 2: John and Mary are co-workers for a major corporation. On several occasions, John and Mary have worked together late into the evening. During such times, John has repeatedly pressured Mary to have sexual relations with him even though Mary has clearly indicated she is offended by such sexual advances.

Scenario 3: Ms. Smith is a senior executive for an accounting firm and she has direct supervision over Paul, one of the junior accountants. Often, Ms. Smith and Paul have worked long hours together. During these times, Paul has often pressured Ms. Smith to have sexual relations with him even though Ms. Smith has clearly indicated she is bothered by such sexual advances.

APPENDIX B  
COVER LETTERS

\*Appropriate Workplace Behavior  
Between the Sexes

TO: University of Florida Employees

I am asking University of Florida employees to participate in a research study of reactions to fictional incidents of workplace sexual harassment. The study is being conducted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree and your participation in this research will provide valuable contributions to the field of organizational or workplace behavior. Your name was chosen on a random basis and permission to ask you to participate has been granted by Mr. W.E. Elmore (VP Administrative Affairs). The responses you give to the items will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous. Once I have received your completed questionnaire, your name will be replaced by a non-traceable number for data analysis purposes only.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the (same) campus envelope as soon as possible to the name and address which appears below. The time required to complete the questionnaire is approximately 30 minutes. To ensure anonymity, please do not write your name on the questionnaire. Indicate below, if you would like to be informed of the results of the study.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Darlene L. Puckett, A.B.D.  
P.O.Box 75  
Psychology Department

---

DETACH AND RETURN BOTTOM PORTION IN ENVELOPE

Name \_\_\_\_\_

I wish to be informed of the results of the study.

\* First mailing cover letter.

APPENDIX B  
COVER LETTERS

\*Appropriate Workplace Behavior  
Between the Sexes

Dear University of Florida Employee,

Several days ago a survey questionnaire on workplace sexual harassment was mailed to you. As previously stated, I am asking University of Florida employees to participate in a research study of reactions to fictional incidents of workplace sexual harassment. The study is being conducted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree and your participation in this research will provide valuable contributions to the field of organizational or workplace behavior. Your name was chosen on a random basis from the University of Florida Directory. The responses you give to the items will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous. Once I have received your completed questionnaire, your name will be replaced by a non-traceable number for data analysis purposes only.

If you have not already done so, please complete the questionnaire and return it in a campus envelope as soon as possible to the name and address which appears below. The time required to complete the questionnaire is approximately 30 minutes. To ensure anonymity, please do not write your name on the questionnaire. Indicate below if you wish to be informed of the results of the study.

Sincerely,

Darlene L. Puckett, A.B.D.  
P.O.Box 75  
Psychology Department

---

DETACH AND RETURN BOTTOM PORTION IN ENVELOPE

Name \_\_\_\_\_

I wish to be informed of the result of the study.

\* Second mailing cover letter.

APPENDIX B  
COVER LETTERS

\*Appropriate Workplace Behavior  
Between the Sexes

Dear University of Florida Employee,

This is a final reminder to encourage you to respond to the survey questionnaire on fictional incidents of workplace sexual harassment (which was previously mailed to you). Your participation will greatly aid the validation of the study. If you have not already done so, please take a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire and return it in a campus envelope as soon as possible to the name and address which appears below. As previously states, the responses you give to the items will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous. Once I have received your completed questionnaire, your name will be replaced by a non-traceable number for data analysis purposes only. Also, please indicate below if you wish to be informed of the results of the study.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Darlene L. Puckett  
P.O.Box 75  
Psychology Department

---

DETACH AND RETURN BOTTOM PORTION IN ENVELOPE

Name \_\_\_\_\_

I wish to be informed of the results of the study. \_\_\_\_\_

\* Final mailing cover letter.

APPENDIX C  
DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Gender by Professionalism and Completed  
Educational Training

Males	101 - Professionals	24 - Non-Professionals
Females	47 - Professionals	94 - Non-Professionals
	1 - Grade Level Only	19 - Earned Bachelor's Degree
Males	23 - Earned High School Diploma or Equivalent	82 - Earned Graduate or Professional Degree
	1 - Grade Level Only	42 - Earned Bachelor's Degree
Females	82 - Earned High School Diploma or Equivalent	20 - Earned Graduate or Professional Degree

APPENDIX C  
DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

## Gender by Number of Employees Supervised

	0-5	6-10	11-15	15 and above
Males	48	10	5	23
With Supervisory Responsibilities				
Females	52	14	3	5
With Supervisory Responsibilities				

APPENDIX C  
DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Gender by Awareness of Sexual  
Harassment in the Workplace

	*1	2	3	4	5
Males	64	36	19	3	0
Females	108	18	6	7	1

\* Survey questionnaire item reads:

How much sexual harassment occurs in the workplace?

1	2	3	4	5
(Not much at all)				(A great amount)



APPENDIX D  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE (DV)  
MEASURES BY SCENARIO

The Supervisor-Initiated Harassment

DV	DV NUMBER					
	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Identification	-.07 (270)	.16** (269)	.02 (268)	.14* (268)	.31*** (261)	.18** (268)
2. Affective Reaction		-.12* (270)	.10 (269)	-.02 (269)	-.11 (262)	.01 (269)
3. Serious			-.13* (268)	-.05 (268)	.37*** (262)	.28*** (268)
4. Self-Confidence				-.02 (268)	-.20** (261)	.10 (267)
5. Fate Similarity					.02 (260)	.01 (267)
6. Expectation of Penalty for Refusal						.19** (260)
7. Coping Strategy						

\* $p < .05$ .

\*\* $p < .01$ .

\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Note. Number in parentheses equal number of observations.

APPENDIX D  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE (DV)  
MEASURES BY SCENARIO

The Co-Worker-Initiated Harassment

DV	DV NUMBER					
	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Identification	-.06 (270)	.30 (270)	.11 (267)	.14* (269)	.21*** (262)	.21*** (266)
2. Affective Reaction		-.28*** (271)	-.02 (268)	-.02 (270)	.01 (263)	-.10 (267)
3. Serious			-.10 (268)	-.03 (270)	.30*** (263)	.36 (267)
4. Self-Confidence				.12* (268)	-.21*** (260)	.12 (264)
5. Fate Similarity					-.05 (262)	-.05 (266)
6. Expectation of Penalty for Refusal						.24*** (259)
7. Coping Strategy						

\* $p < .05$ .

\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Note. Number in parentheses equal number of observations.

APPENDIX D  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE (DV)  
MEASURES BY SCENARIO

The Subordinate-Initiated Harassment

DV	DV NUMBER					
	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Identification	-.01 (269)	.37*** (266)	.01 (268)	.16** (268)	.06 (267)	.09 (265)
2. Affective Reaction		-.21*** (268)	.03 (270)	-.06 (270)	.07 (269)	-.13 (267)
3. Serious			-.02 (267)	-.04 (267)	.12* (266)	.25*** (264)
4. Self-Confidence				-.05 (269)	-.12* (269)	.10 (266)
5. Fate Similarity					-.01 (268)	-.01 (266)
6. Expectation of Penalty for Refusal						-.01 (265)
7. Coping Strategy						

\* $p < .05$ .

\*\* $p < .01$ .

\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Note. Number in parentheses equal number of observations.

APPENDIX E  
MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Identification

	Males		Females	
	*AND	*N-AND	AND	N-AND
*JWB	<u>N</u> =18	54	45	81
*NSR	<u>M</u> =4.56	3.17	3.51	3.41
	<u>SD</u> =.78	1.33	1.25	1.34
JWB	<u>N</u> =81	117	69	81
*SR	<u>M</u> =3.80	3.78	3.87	3.75
	<u>SD</u> =1.04	1.11	1.25	1.17
*NJWB	<u>N</u> =18	24	45	42
NSR	<u>M</u> =3.55	3.58	3.64	3.55
	<u>SD</u> =1.25	1.58	1.23	1.61
NJWB	<u>N</u> =24	39	36	33
SR	<u>M</u> =3.46	3.54	3.61	3.91
	<u>SD</u> =1.02	1.48	1.42	1.26

\* AND=Androgynous, N-AND=Non-Androgynous.

JWB=Just World Believer, NJWB=Non-Just World Believer.

NSR=Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR=With Supervisory Responsibilities.

APPENDIX E  
MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Affective Reaction

	Males		Females	
	*AND	*N-AND	AND	N-AND
*JWB	<u>N</u> =18	54	45	81
*NSR	<u>M</u> =3.39	1.59	1.20	1.60
	<u>SD</u> =1.75	1.04	.50	1.12
JWB	<u>N</u> =81	117	69	81
*SR	<u>M</u> =1.47	1.28	1.27	1.36
	<u>SD</u> =.85	.55	.68	.75
*NJWB	<u>N</u> =18	24	45	42
NSR	<u>M</u> =1.67	1.96	1.31	1.95
	<u>SD</u> =1.03	1.12	.87	1.46
NJWB	<u>N</u> =24	39	39	33
SR	<u>M</u> =2.08	1.54	1.13	1.57
	<u>SD</u> =1.10	.85	.41	1.22

\* AND=Androgynous, N-AND=Non-Androgynous.

JWB=Just World Believer, NJWB=Non-Just World Believer.

NSR=Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR=With Supervisory Responsibilities.

APPENDIX E  
MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Perceived Seriousness

	Males		Females	
	*AND	*N-AND	AND	N-AND
*JWB	<u>N</u> =18	54	45	81
*NSR	<u>M</u> =4.61	3.87	4.51	4.33
	<u>SD</u> =.70	1.23	.66	.88
JWB	<u>N</u> =81	116	69	81
*SR	<u>M</u> =4.38	4.15	4.42	4.55
	<u>SD</u> =.97	1.05	.93	.69
*NJWB	<u>N</u> =18	24	44	41
NSR	<u>M</u> =4.28	3.92	4.36	4.51
	<u>SD</u> =1.23	1.41	.99	1.00
NJWB	<u>N</u> =24	39	38	33
SR	<u>M</u> =3.83	4.20	4.47	4.57
	<u>SD</u> =1.17	1.03	1.06	1.03

\* AND=Androgynous, N-AND=Non-Androgynous.

JWB=Just World Believer, NJWB=Non-Just World Believer.

NSR=Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR=With Supervisory Responsibilities.

APPENDIX E  
MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Self-Confidence

	Males		Females	
	*AND	*N-AND	AND	N-AND
*JWB	<u>N</u> =18	52	45	81
*NSR	<u>M</u> =3.89	3.54	4.04	3.59
	<u>SD</u> =1.23	1.41	1.19	1.17
JWB	<u>N</u> =81	117	69	80
*SR	<u>M</u> =3.68	3.74	4.19	3.71
	<u>SD</u> =1.33	1.29	1.20	1.14
*NJWB	<u>N</u> =18	24	45	42
NSR	<u>M</u> =4.67	3.62	3.87	3.48
	<u>SD</u> = .77	1.58	1.37	1.52
NJWB	<u>N</u> =24	36	39	33
SR	<u>M</u> =3.37	3.83	4.15	3.79
	<u>SD</u> =1.44	1.52	1.18	1.29

\* AND=Androgynous, N-AND=Non-Androgynous.

JWB=Just World Believer, NJWB=Non-Just World Believer.

NSR=Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR=With Supervisory Responsibilities.

APPENDIX E  
MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Expectation of Penalty for Refusal

	Males		Females	
	*AND	*N-AND	AND	N-AND
*JWB	<u>N</u> =18	52	44	78
*NSR	<u>M</u> =3.28	1.98	2.00	2.37
	<u>SD</u> =1.84	1.32	1.26	1.39
JWB	<u>N</u> =79	115	68	80
*SR	<u>M</u> =2.51	2.16	2.37	2.59
	<u>SD</u> =1.42	1.22	1.35	1.38
*NJWB	<u>N</u> =18	24	45	41
NSR	<u>M</u> =2.11	2.29	2.78	2.68
	<u>SD</u> =1.49	1.52	1.68	1.65
NJWB	<u>N</u> =24	33	39	33
SR	<u>M</u> =2.25	1.85	2.26	2.57
	<u>SD</u> =1.36	1.12	1.46	1.50

\* AND=Androgynous, N-AND=Non-Androgynous.

JWB=Just World Believer, NJWB=Non-Just World Believer.

NSR=Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR=With Supervisory Responsibilities.



APPENDIX E  
MULTIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Coping Strategy

	Males		Females	
	*AND	*N-AND	AND	N-AND
*JWB	<u>N</u> =18	50	45	81
*NSR	<u>M</u> =5.72	4.52	5.33	4.58
	<u>SD</u> =.46	1.09	.88	1.38
JWB	<u>N</u> =81	112	69	81
*SR	<u>M</u> =4.80	4.73	4.67	4.95
	<u>SD</u> =1.25	1.15	.98	.93
*NJWB	<u>N</u> =18	24	45	42
NSR	<u>M</u> =5.39	4.75	5.02	4.86
	<u>SD</u> =.78	1.07	.96	1.09
NJWB	<u>N</u> =24	38	39	33
SR	<u>M</u> =4.92	4.76	4.95	4.91
	<u>SD</u> =1.28	1.30	1.12	1.46

\* AND=Androgynous, N-AND=Non-Androgynous.

JWB=Just World Believer, NJWB=Non-Just World Believer.

NSR=Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR=With Supervisory Responsibilities.

APPENDIX F  
UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Identification

		Males				Females			
		*AND		*N-AND		AND		N-AND	
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
*JWB	27	3.85	1.03	39	3.85	1.09	23	4.09	1.20
*NSR	27	3.78	1.09	39	3.74	1.12	23	3.91	1.24
	27	3.78	1.05	39	3.74	1.16	23	3.61	1.30
JWB	6	3.67	1.21	8	4.00	1.41	15	4.07	.88
NSR	6	4.17	.75	8	3.75	1.58	15	3.73	1.28
	6	2.83	1.47	8	3.00	1.77	15	3.13	1.35
NJB	8	3.75	.71	13	3.69	1.49	12	3.83	1.11
SR	8	3.50	1.19	13	3.77	1.42	12	3.58	1.56
	8	3.12	1.12	13	3.15	1.57	12	3.42	1.62

\* AND= Androgynous, N-AND= Non-Androgynous.

JWB= Just World Believer, NJWB= Non-Just World Believer.

NSR= Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR= With Supervisory Responsibilities.

Note. Subscripts a, b, and c refer to order of listed descriptive statistics for the supervisor-initiated, co-worker-initiated, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively.

APPENDIX F  
UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Affective Reaction

Males										Females									
*AND					*N-AND					AND					N-AND				
N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	SD
*JWB 6 <sub>a</sub>	3.17	2.04	18	1.44	.98	15	1.13	.52	27	1.41	1.08	27	1.41	1.08	27	1.41	1.08	27	1.08
*NSR 6 <sub>b</sub>	3.50	1.76	18	1.83	1.34	15	1.20	.56	27	1.74	1.16	27	1.74	1.16	27	1.74	1.16	27	1.16
6 <sub>c</sub>	3.50	1.76	18	1.50	.71	15	1.27	.46	27	1.67	1.14	27	1.67	1.14	27	1.67	1.14	27	1.14
JWB	1.18	.79	39	1.23	.54	23	1.17	.58	27	1.33	.73	27	1.33	.73	27	1.33	.73	27	.73
*SR	1.52	.85	39	1.31	.57	23	1.30	.70	27	1.44	.80	27	1.44	.80	27	1.44	.80	27	.80
27	1.70	.87	39	1.31	.57	23	1.35	.77	27	1.30	.72	27	1.30	.72	27	1.30	.72	27	.72
*NJWB	1.50	.84	8	2.12	1.46	15	1.27	1.03	14	1.78	1.42	14	1.78	1.42	14	1.78	1.42	14	1.42
NSR	1.33	.82	8	1.87	1.12	15	1.53	1.06	14	2.07	1.64	14	2.07	1.64	14	2.07	1.64	14	1.64
6	2.17	1.33	8	1.87	.83	15	1.13	.35	14	2.00	1.41	14	2.00	1.41	14	2.00	1.41	14	1.41
JWB	1.50	.75	13	1.23	.60	13	1.23	.60	11	1.54	1.21	11	1.54	1.21	11	1.54	1.21	11	1.21
SR	2.00	.75	13	1.69	1.03	13	1.08	.28	11	1.64	1.29	11	1.64	1.29	11	1.64	1.29	11	1.29
8	2.75	1.39	13	1.69	.85	13	1.08	.28	11	1.54	1.29	11	1.54	1.29	11	1.54	1.29	11	1.29

\* AND= Androgynous, N-AND= Non-Androgynous.

JWB= Just World Believer, N-AND= Non-Just World Believer.

NSR= Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR= With Supervisory Responsibilities.

Note. Subscripts a, b, c refer to listed order of descriptive statistics for the supervisor-initiated, co-worker-initiated, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively.

APPENDIX F  
UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Perceived Seriousness

		Males						Females					
		*AND			*N-AND			AND			N-AND		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
*JWB	6 <sub>a</sub>	27	4.67	.84	39	4.36	1.06	23	4.78	.52	27	4.78	.42
*NSR	6 <sub>b</sub>	27	4.33	.96	39	4.10	.99	23	4.26	.91	27	4.41	.89
	6 <sub>c</sub>	27	4.15	1.06	38	3.97	1.08	23	4.22	1.17	27	4.48	.64
JWB		6	4.33	1.21	8	4.50	.92	15	4.60	.83	13	4.85	.37
NSR		6	4.67	.82	8	4.00	1.51	15	4.40	.91	14	4.57	.75
		6	3.83	1.60	8	3.25	1.58	14	4.07	1.21	14	4.14	1.46
NJWB		8	4.12	.83	13	4.46	.78	13	3.70	.85	11	4.82	.40
SR		8	3.87	1.25	13	4.08	1.19	13	4.31	1.31	11	4.54	1.21
		8	3.50	1.41	13	4.08	1.11	12	4.42	1.00	11	4.36	1.29

\* AND= Androgynous, N-AND= Non-Androgynous.

JWB= Just World Believer, NJWB= Non-Just World Believer.

NSR= Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR= With Supervisory Responsibilities.

Note. Subscripts a,b,c refer to the listed order of descriptive statistics for the supervisor-initiated, co-worker-initiated, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively.

APPENDIX F  
UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Self-Confidence

										Males										Females									
										*AND					*N-AND					AND					N-AND				
										N	M	SD			N	M	SD			N	M	SD			N	M	SD		
*JWB										6 <sub>a</sub>	3.50	1.38			17	3.41	1.32			15	3.80	1.32			27	2.89	1.25		
*NSR										6 <sub>b</sub>	3.83	1.17			17	3.59	1.37			15	4.13	1.06			27	3.74	.90		
										6 <sub>c</sub>	4.33	1.21			18	3.61	1.58			15	4.20	1.21			27	4.15	.99		
JWB										27	3.41	1.42			39	3.46	1.25			23	3.74	1.39			27	3.41	1.22		
*SR										27	3.81	1.24			39	3.77	1.31			23	4.35	1.11			26	3.85	.97		
										27	3.81	1.33			39	4.00	1.28			23	4.48	.99			27	3.89	1.19		
*NJWB										6	4.67	.52			8	3.37	1.77			15	3.60	1.35			14	3.14	1.41		
NSR										6	4.50	1.22			8	3.50	1.69			15	3.93	1.39			14	3.43	1.65		
										6	4.83	.41			8	4.00	1.41			15	4.07	1.44			14	3.86	1.51		
NJWB										8	2.87	1.46			12	3.50	1.68			13	3.61	1.39			11	3.45	1.44		
SR										8	3.50	1.51			12	3.67	1.67			13	4.31	1.03			11	3.82	1.33		
										8	3.75	1.39			12	4.33	1.15			13	4.54	.98			11	4.09	1.14		

\* AND= Androgynous, N-AND= Non-Androgynous.

JWB= Just World Believer, NJWB= Non-Just World Believer.

NSR= Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR= With Supervisory Responsibilities.

Note. Subscripts a, b, and c refer to order of listed descriptive statistics for the supervisor-initiated, co-worker-initiated, and subordinated-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively.

APPENDIX F  
UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Expectation of Penalty for Refusal

Males										Females									
*AND					*N-AND					AND					N-AND				
N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
*JWB 6a	4.67	.52	17	2.70	1.49	14	2.93	1.33	26	3.65	1.13	26	3.65	1.13	26	3.65	1.13		
*NSR 6b	2.83	1.83	17	1.88	1.17	15	1.87	1.12	26	1.96	1.04	26	1.96	1.04	26	1.96	1.04		
6c	2.33	2.06	18	1.39	.98	15	1.27	.70	26	1.50	.95	26	1.50	.95	26	1.50	.95		
JWB	26	3.69	1.12	38	3.05	1.15	23	3.65	1.03	27	3.74	.90	27	3.74	.90	27	3.74	.90	
*SR	26	2.38	1.33	38	2.13	1.09	22	2.04	1.09	26	2.54	1.27	26	2.54	1.27	26	2.54	1.27	
	27	1.48	.80	39	1.31	.73	23	1.39	.72	27	1.48	.89	27	1.48	.89	27	1.48	.89	
*NJWB	6	3.67	1.50	8	3.37	1.68	15	4.33	.72	13	4.00	1.22	13	4.00	1.22	13	4.00	1.22	
NSR	6	1.50	.84	8	2.12	1.46	15	2.80	1.70	14	2.78	1.62	14	2.78	1.62	14	2.78	1.62	
6	1.17	.41	8	1.37	.52	15	1.20	.41	14	1.36	.84	14	1.36	.84	14	1.36	.84		
NJWB	8	3.50	1.41	10	2.90	1.20	13	3.38	1.26	11	3.54	1.57	11	3.54	1.57	11	3.54	1.57	
SR	8	2.12	.83	11	1.73	.90	13	2.23	1.48	11	2.27	1.19	11	2.27	1.19	11	2.27	1.19	
8	1.12	.35	12	1.08	.29	13	1.15	.55	11	1.91	1.30	11	1.91	1.30	11	1.91	1.30		

\* AND= Androgynous, N-AND= Non-Androgynous.

JWB= Just World Believer, NJWB= Non-Just World Believer.

NSR= Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR= With Supervisory Responsibilities.

Note. Subscripts a, b, and c refer to order of listed descriptive statistics for the supervisor-initiated, co-worker-initiated, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively.

APPENDIX F  
UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON CELL GROUPS

Coping Strategy

		Males						Females					
		*AND			*N-AND			AND			N-AND		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
*JWB	6 <sub>a</sub>	6	5.83	.41	17	4.59	1.00	15	5.27	.96	27	4.67	1.04
*NSR	6 <sub>b</sub>	6	5.67	.52	16	4.44	1.26	15	5.27	.88	27	4.41	1.28
	6 <sub>c</sub>	6	5.67	.52	17	4.53	1.07	15	5.47	.83	27	4.67	1.75
JWB	27	27	4.96	1.19	38	4.66	1.10	23	4.69	.93	27	4.85	.86
*SR	27	27	4.81	1.07	37	4.65	1.11	23	4.56	.73	27	4.78	.89
	27	27	4.63	1.47	37	4.89	1.24	23	4.74	1.25	27	5.22	1.01
*NJWB	6	6	5.33	.82	8	4.62	1.06	15	4.93	1.03	14	4.78	1.18
NSR	6	6	5.17	.75	8	4.75	1.16	15	4.93	.88	14	4.71	1.14
	6	6	5.67	.82	8	4.87	1.12	15	5.20	1.01	14	5.07	1.00
NJWB	8	8	5.00	.92	13	5.00	1.00	13	4.85	1.21	11	5.18	1.54
SR	8	8	4.62	1.06	13	4.69	1.44	13	4.69	1.18	11	4.73	1.49
	8	8	5.12	1.81	12	4.58	1.50	13	5.31	.95	11	4.82	1.47

\* AND= Androgynous, N-AND= Non-Androgynous.

JWB= Just World Believer, NJWB= Non-Just World Believer.

NSR= Without Supervisory Responsibilities, SR= With Supervisory Responsibilities.

Note. Subscripts a, b, and c refer to order of listed descriptive statistics for the supervisor-initiated, co-worker-initiated, and subordinate-initiated harassment scenarios, respectively.

APPENDIX G  
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE ON OVERALL  
AFFECTIVE REACTION SCORES

Source	df	F	P
Sex	3	9.24	.0001
Just World Beliefs (JWB)	3	.92	.4319
Sex X JWB	3	2.54	.0562
Supervisory Responsibilities (SR)	3	3.78	.0112
Sex X SR	3	3.69	.0126
JWB X SR	3	2.13	.0954
Sex X JWB X SR	3	4.74	.0033
Sex Role Orientation (SRO)	3	3.01	.0304
Sex X SRO	3	10.12	.0001
JWB X SRO	3	2.13	.0952
Sex X JWB X SRO	3	1.76	.1531
SR X SRO	3	.17	.9135
Sex X SR X SRO	3	1.06	.3666
JWB X SR X SRO	3	2.96	.0326
Sex X JWB X SR X SRO	3	2.56	.0543
ERROR	252		



APPENDIX H  
UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON COPING STRATEGY  
FOR THE SUPERVISOR-INITIATED HARASSMENT SCENARIO

Source	df	MS	F
Sex	1	.41	.38
Just World Beliefs (JWB)	1	.00	.00
Sex X JWB	1	.17	.16
Supervisory Responsibilities (SR)	1	.83	.76
Sex X SR	1	.60	.55
JWB X SR	1	1.91	1.76
Sex X JWB X SR	1	.02	.02
Sex-Role Orientation (SRO)	1	5.07	4.66*
Sex X SRO	1	3.24	2.98
JWB X SRO	1	1.41	1.30
Sex X JWB X SRO	1	.00	.01
SR X SRO	1	5.62	5.17*
Sex X SR X SRO	1	.03	.03
JWB X SR X SRO	1	.17	.16
Sex X JWB X SR X SRO	1	.00	.00
ERROR	248		

\* $p < .05$ .

APPENDIX H  
UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON COPING STRATEGY  
FOR THE CO-WORKER-INITIATED HARASSMENT SCENARIO

Source	df	MS	F
Sex	1	.20	.17
Just World Beliefs (JWB)	1	.06	.05
Sex X JWB	1	.12	.10
Supervisory Responsibilities (SR)	1	2.53	2.14
Sex X SR	1	.36	.31
JWB X SR	1	.00	.00
Sex X JWB X SR	1	.06	.05
Sex-Role Orientation (SRO)	1	6.04	5.12*
Sex X SRO	1	.99	.84
JWB X SRO	1	1.76	1.49
Sex X JWB X SRO	1	.26	.22
SR X SRO	1	6.39	5.41*
Sex X SR X SRO	1	.34	.03
JWB X SR X SRO	1	2.01	1.71
Sex X JWB X SR X SRO	1	.00	.00
ERROR	248		

\* $p < .05$ .

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Darlene Puckett was born in Nashville, Tennessee, on May 25, 1956. She was the youngest of four children born to Chester and Rosetta Puckett. Following graduation from Pearl High School in Nashville, she attended Vanderbilt University. In 1978, she graduated from Vanderbilt University with B.A. in psychology. In September of 1978, she began graduate work in social psychology at the University of Florida. She received the Master of Arts degree and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in psychology in 1981 and 1984, respectively.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Marvin E. Shaw, Chairman  
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Franz R. Epting  
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Theodore Landsman  
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Phyllis M. Meek  
Associate Professor of Counselor  
Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*Stephen Olejnik*

---

Stephen F. Olejnik

Associate Professor of Foundations of  
Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Psychology in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August, 1984

---

Dean for Graduate Studies and  
Research